Government Response to Industry Questions / Comments
on the
September 2005 Draft CEDS RFP

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	11	4	The ~~PD~~ PM shall have full responsibility, authority, and accountability for decision-making and management actions necessary for successful performance of the contract including the authority to commit to courses of action, budgets, and schedules. The acronym PD is not introduced in this paragraph nor appears anywhere else before its use. Also, it does not fit the context.	Paragraph 3.1.2.1 of SOW will be changed from "PD" to "PM".
2	20	3	In addition to the TRM exit criteria, the Contractor shall provide a preliminary system LCC analysis. Any exit criteria not successfully achieved shall be addressed as an entrance criterion at the PDR ~~review~~. This is redundant finish to this sentence: "…at the Preliminary Design Review review."	Paragraph 3.2.2.1.1 of SOW will be revised to delete "review".
3	C-2	(e)	MS Office Ver.2000, & Trademark symbol ® Is it latest version	MS Office Version 2000 is the Cognizant Technical Program Office's resident software package, and is supported by the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI).
4	C-5	(C)	Blank spot, Need authorized by _____ Identify person/function Additionally on page C-4 replace blank in sub-paragraph (a) with "CEDS"	The RFP will be modified to replace the blank with "individual Delivery Orders placed under this contract."
5	B-10	e	Define the word "Reclama" or reword this title. Could not find this word in the dictionary	The title of this section will be changed to 'Award Fee Determination Procedures.'
6	E-5	4	The Contractor shall support any software it develops in accordance to MIL-HDBK-61A. Although software under goes extensive testing unforeseen problems can still arise. Also, with obsolescence issues new device drivers are required.	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.
7			**Overall:** Per the CEDS Industry Day briefing, we were expecting a Draft CEDS RFP with Section L & M, but they were not provided. Additionally, we have been told that Section L & M will not be made available until the final RFP. As such, we are providing some comments on the Sections L & M information contained in the briefing slides.	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
8			Section L Questions: Based on the CEDS Industry Day presentation, primarily in terms of the multiple Phase I awards that are down-selected to one Phase II award for Display Consoles and another Phase II award for Remote Displays - *Recommendation:* A streamlined Phase I bidding process, such as only requiring fifty (50) pages for Display Consoles or Remote Displays (i.e., 100 pages max proposal limit) with no other plans (i.e., PMP, CM, QA, etc.) being asked for as part of the required technical/management response. Also, require only five (5) to ten (10) past performances that are directly associated with consoles and large screen displays.	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.
9			Section M Questions: Based on the CEDS Industry Day presentation *Recommendation:* Any proposals that request little or no funding for Phase I may not be in the best interests of the Navy in terms of the final IDIQ pricing. At the very least, these proposals should be awarded in addition to the two (2) funded efforts for Display Consoles/Remote Displays (i.e., the four (4) awards discussed at Industry Day).	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.
10			Based on the Phase I award criteria from Industry Day (see below): *Recommendation:* Assuming that these evaluation criteria are in priority order, include both a Technical Capability and Management Approach as the highest priority item.	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.
11			Based on the Phase II award criteria from Industry Day (see below): *Recommendation:* Assuming that these evaluation criteria are in priority order, please ensure Phase II does not become just a "low cost shootout" between the contractors.	The Navy intends to make a "best value" contract award based on an evaluation of the Offeror's Management Approach and Capabilities, Technical Approach, Cost Proposal, and Past Performance.
12			[We] would like the opportunity to submit a series of comments focused on our development path and the new technologies that we can incorporate into the CEDS Program. However, we are concerned that responses to the Government may be public information and do not wish to compromise our competitive advantage in the marketplace. Will it be possible to submit questions and comments in confidence to the Government?	In order to ensure fair and equal competition, answers to industry questions will be made available to all competitors.
13			[We] would additionally like to ask the Government if we can receive an extension for submittal of general questions, comments, and concerns we have for the Draft Systems Requirement Document?	The government will not extend the question, comment, and concern period for the Draft SRD. Any comments received will be considered but will not be answered.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
14			**Overall:** Per the CEDS Industry Day request, we have focused on recommendations and proposed resolutions that (1) identify significant cost drivers; (2) identify overly restrictive requirements which interfere with or prevent achieving the CEDS vision; (3) identify requirements not in accordance with Best Commercial Practices; and (4) identify restrictions on competition (if any).	Comment noted, but no associated change to the RFP documentation is anticipated.
15		Section L & M	Does the government intend to issue RFP Sections L and M for review and comment?	No.
16	Page B-1,		CLIN 0001 and subsequent CLINs: This draft does not seem to allow for the award of both Display Consoles and Remote Displays to one contractor. Said differently, CLIN 0001 has SLINs for both contracts, but no other CLIN has the corresponding SLINs. *Rationale:* Contractors would like to bid on both Consoles and Remote Displays. *Recommendation:* Provide the SLINs for all of the appropriate CLINs.	SLINS will be established for all appropriate CLINs in order to differentiate between Display Consoles and Remote Displays.
17	Page B-2,	CLIN 0011:	CLIN0011 provides data for CLINs 0009 and 0010 and is Not Separately Priced (NSP), but it states that price is included only in CLIN 0010. Recommendation: Reword as "(NSP – Price included in price of Items 0009 and 0010)"	RFP will be corrected as recommended.
18	Page B-3,	Note F:	Are the quantities of 50 & 1000 a total for Display Consoles and Remote Displays combined or are these the min/max for each of the two display types? *Rationale*: Wording could be interpreted either way. *Recommendation*: Clarify wording or add simple table to identify each quantity for both Display Consoles and Remote Displays.	Note F will be clarified in the final RFP.
19	Page C-1,		DATA RIGHTS IN TECHNICAL DATA DELIVERED IN DIGITAL FORM, and Page C-2, ELECTRONIC TRANSFER OF INFORMATION: Are other digital formats acceptable, such as Adobe Acrobat? *Also*, how should the contractor handle third party COTS manuals that we do not have original source for and which are probably copyrighted by the originator? *Rational*: Both MicroSoft Office and Adobe Acrobat are widely available applications in the commercial marketplace with viewer software. *Recommendation*: Specify both MicroSoft Office and Adobe Acrobat as acceptable digital formats for delivery.	Other digital formats, such as Adobe Acrobat, are not acceptable, the RFP will be changed to require MS office format unless otherwise specified on the CDRL. The winning Contractor(s) will be responsible for obtaining the necessary data rights or licenses from third party COTS sources needed to deliver items and services identified in the RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
20	Page C-4,		ITEM 0011 – ENGINEERING SERVICES (NAVSEA) (APR 2004): Since CLIN 0011 just provides data for CLINs 0009 and 0010, it seems that this clause should be attached to CLIN 0010 for Technical and Engineering Services. *Recommendation:* Correct the reference from CLIN 0011 to CLIN 0010.	The ITEM 0011 reference will be deleted from this Engineering Services clause.
21	Page C-17,		CONTRACTOR'S PROPOSAL (NAVSEA) (MAR 2001): Since the contractor's RFP response is to be incorporated into the resulting CEDS contract at a lower "ORDER OF PRECEDENCE" (per FAR clause 52.215.8) than just "the specification", but which specification is being referenced by the Navy? *Rationale:* Is the Navy trying to manage at the level of the CEDS System Requirements Document, while allowing the contractor's proposal to take precedence over the SOW and CDRLs. *Recommendation:* Identify the appropriate documents as "the specification".	A note has been added to Section C, following the NAVSEA Contractor's Proposal Clause identifying the CEDS System Requirements Document as the specification referred to in FAR 52.215.8
22	Page C-21,		USE OF NAVY SUPPORT CONTRACTORS FOR OFFICIAL CONTRACT FILES (NAVSEA) (APR 2004): Will the current or future Navy support contractors be required to sign the winning contractor's non-disclosure form?	The support contractor will sign non-disclosure forms as part of its contract with the Navy. However, the support contract will not require that the support contractor sign the non-disclosure forms of all the prime contractors with whom the Navy/NAVSEA does business.
23	Page H-5,		Special Clause H-5 SPECIAL ORDERING PROCEDURES AND PROGRAM SERVICES FUNDING: Will the Navy specify the additive charge rate for Program Services or is the contractor expected to propose this rate? *Rational:* This is the ~6% tax that was collected on all Q-70 orders that the Navy expects the contractor to credit back to them for any direct sales of CEDS equipment to other prime contractors. *Recommendation:* Please provide the additive charge rate for Program Services.	The rate will be specified in the final RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
24	Page I-31,		52-209.3 FIRST ARTICLE APPROVAL – CONTRACTOR TESTING (SEP 1989) AND ALTERNATIVE I (JAN 1997) AND ALTERNATIVE II (SEP 1989): This clause does not seem appropriate for CLINs 0009 and 0010 unless this is where the contractor produces new configurations or update the initial variants as part of , say, Technical Insertion/Refresh process. Said differently, there does not seem to be any mechanism to develop and qualify updates to or possibly new variants that then become orderable as part of the existing (or new) IDIQ CLINs. *Rationale:* CLINs 0009 and 0010 can be utilized to deliver administrative paperwork, studies and analyses, etc.; as well as updated or new CEDS variants. Recommendation: Specify the mechanism whereby new and updated variants become part of the existing IDIQ CLINs and/or specify a new IDIQ CLIN for new CEDS variants.	The description of Item 0009 and Item 0010 in Section C states "Under This CLIN, the contractor may be tasked to conduct any effort included in the scope of the Statement of Work, including but not limited to: special engineering studies; design, development, and qualification of technology refresh kits or new system configurations; and engineering services." As such, FAR 52-209.3 applies to CLINs 0009 and 0010.
25	Page I-40,		52.216.19 ORDER LIMITATIONS (OCT 1995): The "**" items are being used for both a quantity per month in the first two locations and the number of days in the third location. *Recommendation:* Please insert the required information directly and use the "**" items just for the phrase "There shall be no quantity limitations for other CEDS equipment (kits, parts, LRUs, components, etc.)."	The FAR states that a clause similar to 52.216.19 must be inserted in IDIQ contracts. The final RFP will have the clause clearly structured with quantities listed in the clause, not in notes.
26			In the final RFP, will items identified either as "optional" or as an "option" in the SRD be identified under separate CLINs for which pricing will be required? If not, how will optional items be handled?	Optional items in the SRD will be developed and qualified under CLIN 0009 or CLIN 0010 (as noted in the Section C line item description). Production of these optional items will be supported by adding an associated SLIN to a production line item.
27			Can a foreign entity bid directly on CEDS?	Any entity that meets the requirements of the Contract DD Form 254, Security Classification Specification, may bid on the contract.
28			Does the government intend to make RFP Sections L & M available for review in draft format?	Duplicate question, see item 15.
29			At Industry Day, price expectations presented by Government were $500K for Display Consoles and $250K for Remote Displays. Is this for each variant or for all displays/consoles within the family? Will the government entertain proposals exceeding these expectations?	The $500K NTE price, specified in Section B note A, is for the preliminary development of one configuration for the Display Console. The $250K NTE price, specified in Section B note A, is for the preliminary development of one configuration of Medium Screen Remote Display and one configuration of Large Screen Remote Display. If a Contractor's proposed price for Phase I exceeds the Government's established maximum price, the Offeror may be ineligible for award.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
30			If the government has technical data rights to existing console designs (including peripherals and items that could provide commonality) will access to the technical data package be granted in response to industry requests?	If requested, the government will provide access to any government owned, unrestricted technical data which is deemed necessary for performance of the contract. However, the government will not guarantee the accuracy of such data nor will it be considered GFI.
31			Phase 2 of the program is Time and Materials, yet the RFP specifically indicates that the qualification / first article testing will be at the contractors expense (C-18, I-31). Who will be responsible for qualification costs?	The government will pay all qualification costs allowed by the NAVSEA First Article Clause in Section C and FAR Clause 52.209-3 and Alternate I and II contained in Section I.
32			Performance Based Logistics Supply Support is called for in the SOW as outlined in Appendix C of the SOW. Are all elements of the PBL, other than Year 1 Production Spares, to be un-priced?	Supply Support elements are to be firm-fixed price for the life of the contract or no less then 2-years.
33			General. Would the Government consider issuing a second draft of the RFP containing sections L-M prior to release of the final RFP?	Duplicate question, see item 15.
34			CLIN 0009, Note D, page B-3 "Prices shall be in accordance with Section B of this Contract." This is identified as a CPAF CLIN. What prices will be associated with this CLIN?	The last sentence of Note D will be deleted. CLIN Pricing Instructions will be provided in Section L.
35			Part I – Schedule, page C-4, lines 9 thru 11—The reference to Special Contract Requirement H-4 appears to be incorrect. H-4 addresses Technical Instructions, not the Commercial Credit and Program Services Funding.	The correct reference is Special Contract Requirement H-5. This will be corrected in the final RFP.
36			Will a draft of RFP Sections L and M be provided and if so, when?	Duplicate question, see item 15.
37			Will the Government issue a new Phase 2 RFP with an updated Statement of Work and System Requirements Document prior to the bidding of Phase 2 or will each Phase I contactor bid their own Phase 2 design solutions with their design solutions held proprietary and if so, when?	A Phase 2 RFP is not planned to be released. Each contractor will submit Phase 2 proposals for their respective Phase 1 preliminary designs. Specific time requirements will be provided in the final RFP.
38			Will the competitive strategies delivered as part of each Phase I proposal and the proprietary architectures presented at the Phase I Preliminary Design Review become openly disclosed to potential competitors in the Government's non-requirements CEDS business environment and if so, when?	Competitive strategies delivered as part of Phase I proposals and any proprietary architectures presented at Phase I Preliminary Design Reviews will not be disclosed to potential competitors.
39			Will questions be allowed after the final RFP is issued?	The final RFP will contain instructions and timeframes for submitting questions and/or requests for clarifications concerning the RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
40			**Overall:** Recommend that the CDRLs be referenced throughout the SOW where they are associated with the work efforts so that the contractor can better understand the Navy's requirements. Additionally, the Navy needs to clarify the relationship between the CEDS SOW in general and the Appendix C SOW for Performance Based Logistics.	The SOW will be revised to reference associated CDRLs
41	Page 8,	Section 2.3:	Since the contractor's RFP response is to be incorporated into the resulting CEDS contract at a lower "ORDER OF PRECEDENCE" (per FAR clause 52.215.8) than just the associated "specification", but which specification is being referenced by the Navy? *Rationale:* Is the Navy trying to manage at the level of the CEDS System Requirements Document, while allowing the contractor's proposal to take precedence over the SOW and CDRLs. *Recommendation:* Identify the relationship (i.e., order of precedence) between the contractor's RFP response and this SOW and CDRLs.	The SOW and CDRLs are attachments to the contract and are part of FAR 52-215-8 (d). As specified by the NAVSEA Contractor Proposal Clause, the RFP Order of Precedence follows the specifications. See also, item 21.
42	Page 11,	Section 3.1.2.6:	This section calls out a Life Cycle Cost (LCC) analysis to be performed and other attachments define the LCC timeline to be 15 years. However, the CEDS SRD (page 27) states that the service life is 30 years. *Rationale:* Since LCC analysis will utilize the Acquisition Cost (Recurring / Non-Recurring) figures, all cost calculations (both Acquisition Cost and Operation & Support) should be presented in same year dollars. *Recommendation:* State whether the contract is dealing with 15 year or 30 year service life. Also, this may need to be reflected back into the CEDS SRD.	The correct service life for CEDS is 30 years. The final RFP and SOW will be corrected as required to reflect this value. Service life requirements will be deleted from the SRD.
43	Page 11,	Section 3.1.2.6:	What Constant Year Dollars and Net Present Value for the Life Cycle Cost (LCC) calculations are to be provided or defined? *Rationale:* LCC analysis folks should be using the latest provided / available Acquisition Cost figures and only generating the corresponding Operation & Support. *Recommendation:* State what information is to be provided, what constant year dollars LCC should be utilized, and reference a set of approved inflation indices to be used (e.g. VAMOSC Inflation Indices, dtd xx/xx/xx).	Specific guidance on assumptions to be made and data to be submitted in the LCC will be provided in the final RFP.
44	Page 12,	Section 3.1.2.8.1	Page 23, Section 3.2.2.12, Asking for a Post-Award Conference (PAC) 30 days after contract award(s) and a System Requirements Review (SRR) 60 days after contract award(s) is counter productive to the Phase I efforts and should be combined into one review at, say, 45 days after award. *Rationale:* Eliminates unnecessary requirements. *Recommendation:* Combine the PAC and SRR activities.	The requirement for a Post Award Conference will be deleted from Phase I contract. A Post Award Conference will be added to Phase II.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
45	Page 14,	Section 3.1.3.2	Page 16, Section 3.1.3.3, What role will CEDS play with regard to the Open Architecture (OA) and the Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA)? Will CEDS be a "follower" and simply ensure that it provides the required hardware (e.g., graphics, display, HMI device) items, or will CEDS be involved in the definition of the OA/MOSA to achieve this? *Rationale:* In order to achieve an OA/MOSA, the various commands and program offices have to agree on a common profile for the products/technologies/capabilities. In today's computing environments, this is achieved at the higher levels (e.g., OACE Category III and IV) primarily through middleware/application software. If CEDS is just a computing platform that has to provide the necessary resources (e.g., graphics card, displays, HMI devices) that support the OA/MOSA profiles, this is achievable in the "follower" position. *Recommendation:* Clarify the role of this SOW and the overall contract with respect to the OA and MOSA. Also, any clarification may need to be reflected in the CEDS SRD.	CEDS must provide the required hardware to support OA/MOSA design requirements. The CEDS program will not be involved in the development of the OA/MOSA definition.
46	Page 17,	Section 3.1.3.4:	The acronym NESI is not listed in Appendix B. *Rationale*: Administrative. *Recommendation*: Include acronym in Appendix B.	NESI (Net-Centric Enterprise Solutions for Interoperability) will be in Appendix B of the final SOW.
47	Page 17,	Section 3.1.3.4:	Is Navy/Marine Corps Internet or Integrated Shipboard Network System certification required for the console, software and training? *Rationale:* Need clarification on what IT requirements are to be invoked. This may impact cost and schedule if left unanswered. *Recommendation:* Recommend that the Navy clarify the various IT requirements for software, hardware and training products.	No.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
48	Page 20,	Section 3.1.6:	This section discusses contractor responsibility for delivering a System Safety Program Plan and the corresponding implementation of a safety program in accordance with MIL-STD-882. Has a decision been made as to which version of MIL-STD-882 Data Item Descriptions is to be used? *Rationale:* MIL-STD-882D is the current version in effect and is about to be replaced with MIL-STD-882E. A final draft of MIL-STD-882E is under review and planned for implementation during the last quarter of FY-05 or first quarter of FY-06. The major problem with MIL-STD-882D is that it does not include the specific Task and Data Item Descriptions required to develop and maintain an active safety program. Currently, these must be drawn from MIL-STD-882C, which has been superseded. *Recommendation:* Specify the use of MIL-STD-882 Rev "C" or upcoming Rev "E" for a full MIL-SPEC Safety program, but please consider a Best Commercial Practices approach with MIL-STD-882 Rev "D" provided only as guidance.	The RFP cannot reference a draft MIL-STD. If MIL-STD-882E is not approved at the time of RFP release, MIL-STD 882D will be referenced as guidance. The SOW provides direction on content.
49	Page 20,	Section 3.1.7:	Will the operational availability requirements be given as part of some Government document or do they need to be calculated by the contractor as the design is completed? *Rationale:* Need to clarify the definition of operational availability requirement, A_o or some other qualitative measure. This will impact the RMA process. *Recommendation:* Recommend defining the origin of the operational availability requirement and specify the measurement or metric required.	System reliability requirements are specified as Mean Time Between Operational Mission Failure (MTBOMF) – not Operational Availability (Ao). System MTBOMF requirements are specified in the SRD. The final SRD will include specific definition of an Operational Mission Failure.
50	Page 23,	Section 3.2.1:	What delivery orders will be associated with CLIN 0001 that is the basis of Phase I awards? *Rationale:* There is nothing in the RFP to indicate any Phase I funding over and above the FFP dollars for Display Consoles and Remote Displays. *Recommendation:* Remove the reference to delivery orders for Phase I.	The reference to "delivery order(s)" will be removed from 3.2.1.
51	Page 25,	Section 3.3.2.2.1:	These Program Reviews can only detract from the Critical Design Review (CDR), Test Readiness Review (TRR), and Production Readiness Review (PRR) technical reviews in Phase II. As such, they should not overlap with the CDR, TRR or PRR. Rationale: The audience for the Program Reviews and the material presented is very different from the technical audience associated with CDR, TRR, and PRR. *Recommendation:* Move the Program Reviews away from the major technical reviews and schedule them monthly or quarterly, as appropriate.	Program reviews will be required semi-annually after PRR.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
52	Page 33,	Section 3.3.5.2.1:	Is it the intent of the Navy to have the M-Demo be a TECHEVAL of CEDS in same manner as it was for the Q-70. *Rationale:* The Q-70 program had its OPEVAL as part of some other program, but performed a TECHEVAL as part of the M-Demo activities. *Recommendation:* State the intent to TECHEVAL as part of M-Demo or not.	M-Demo will be part of the Navy's TECHEVAL with COMOPTEVFOR present.
53	Page 35,	Section 3.3.6.2.1:	This section discusses a CEDS maintenance strategy with regard to both Organization-Level (O) and Depot-Level (D) requirements, but does not refer to any Intermediate-Level (I) requirements. Has a decision been made to eliminate I-Level from the CEDS maintenance concept? *Rationale:* Need clarification that I-Level maintenance responsibilities are not required. *Recommendation:* Recommend that the Navy clarify that its maintenance concept is a two level strategy consisting of only O-Level (Ship's Force) and D-Level (contractor).	This section will be clarified to state that the CEDS maintenance concept does not include I-level maintenance.
54	Page 35,	Section 3.3.6.2.2:	Will the Planned Maintenance System (PMS) source data be developed using the RCM level 1 and 2 theory and processes? *Rationale:* Need clarification that Maintenance Requirements Cards (MRC) development is not IAW NAVSEA 04 RCM principles for inclusion into the 3M PMS system and waivers are in place. RCM level 2 process implementation will be more costly than RCM Level 1 and in turn more costly that waiving the requirement. *Recommendation:* Recommend that the Navy clarify the level of maintenance requirement certification necessary for approval of the MRCs and Maintenance Index Pages (MIP)s or that Best Commercial Practices is acceptable.	Planned Maintenance System source data will be developed using Reliability Center Maintenance requirements per MIL-P-24534A.
55	Page 35,	Section 3.3.6.3:	Is there a requirement for the training product to be incorporated into the Integrated Learning Environment (ILE) accessible via Navy Knowledge Online (NKO) website? To facilitate the development of training, will "Skill Object" data be made available? *Rationale:* Need clarification on what and where the training product uses and accesses will be. Will this new console create or modify any of the basic core task or sub-task of the sailor, either operator or maintainer? *Recommendation:* Recommend that the Navy clarify the training product user environment, as well as the availability of existing training data.	The CEDS Program Office, PEO IWS6.0, will deliver contractor-developed training products to NKO and CEDS users (host systems) for incorporation into their training programs.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
56	Page 41,	Section 3.3.6.10	Page C-22, Section 2.19, Is Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) required? This section provides extensive discussion of Unique Item Identification (UID)s and Page C-22 mentions using automatic identification technologies such as bar coding, contact memory buttons, but does not mention RFID. However, USD(AT&L) Policy of 30 July 2004 states "Radio Frequency Identification will be a mandatory DoD requirement on solicitations issued on or after October I, 2004 for delivery of materiel on or after January I, 2005." *Rationale:* RFID technology is being addressed in separate DoD policy. The RFID policy, which addresses the labeling for shipping and packaging, is being developed in close coordination with the UID Program Office. RFID requirements will not replace or supersede UID requirements. If RFID is mandated for CEDS as a part of CEDS Total Asset Visibility requirements, then provide clarification on RFID utilization and intended integration with legacy systems. *Recommendation:* Add "CEDS equipment shall have RFID tags at the LRU level. The Navy shall provide RFID tag part numbers prior to production of CEDS equipment". As required, add the USD (AT&L) Policy and the DOD Suppliers' Passive RFID Information Guide Version 7.0 as references. *Alternatively,* commit to UID as a Best Commercial Practices approach where the contractors inventory management business case assessment for part serialization and asset visibility shall drive the appropriate mix of automatic identification technologies (e.g., contact memory buttons, RFID tags, 2D Bar codes, etc.) to meet UID policy.	The CEDS program does not require RFID under DFAR 252.211-7006.
57		SOW 6	Page 6 of the SOW lists a number of PEO IWS, SPAWAR, and PEO C4I documents as references. Are these documents available? Has the government considered establishing a centralized reading room for all references?	Referenced documents that are not readily available will be made available on the Electronic Reading Room, listed in section J of the RFP. These documents will be posted concurrently with release of the final RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
58		SOW 3.1.2.1	SOW paragraph 3.1.2.1 is inconsistent with the distribution requirements in the CDRL. If the CDRL is correct, recommend re-wording this paragraph to say deliver data in accordance with the CDRL.	In the final RFP, the relevant paragraph of the SOW will be reworded as follows: **3.1.2.1 Data Management.** The Contractor shall post contract data and applicable deliverables to a Government specified website, unless otherwise specified on the applicable Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL). The Contractor shall provide electronic-mail (e-mail) notification to the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and any other Government identified personnel within 24 hours of posting new/revised information and CDRL deliverable(s) on the website.
59		3.1.2.9	Paragraph 3.1.2.9 specifies IPT and Working Group participation. No IPTs and only two (ILS and Reliability) Working Groups are called out in the SOW. Are there others? Does the government have an estimate of the level of effort for IPT participation required by paragraph 3.1.2.9?	IPT/RWG participation will be required and funded on an as-needed basis.
60		3.1.3.2	Recommend that the last sentence of 3.1.3.2 be modified to read as follows: Use of standards that are not specified within this contract must be approved by the Government prior to their use.	The recommended revision will be included in the final RFP.
61		3.1.3.5	The last sentence in the first paragraph of 3.1.3.5 reads as follows: The contractor shall clearly define HSI improvements in human and system mission performance and capabilities. What is the point of reference for quantifying improvements (i.e., improvements compared to what)?	The SOW will be changed to require HSI analyses and tradeoffs to be reported at all technical reviews.
62		3.1.5	On page 19 of the SOW, the third full paragraph under 3.1.5 starts with "FRACAS required data fields include…" but does not list data fields.	The requirements for a FRACAS program will be deleted from the final RFP.
63		3.3.3.2	For clarity, recommend that the first two sentences in 3.3.3.2 be modified to read as follows: "Prior to the conduct of functional qualification testing, the Contractor shall establish, develop and deliver, an OE baseline(s) which will constitute the initial software product baseline. The Contractor shall manage this baseline until a successful PRR is held. The product baseline will then transition to the control of the Government."	The recommended clarification will be incorporated into the SOW.
64		3.4	Should training mode(s), online or offline, be shown in Section 3.4, Figure 2?	Training mode(s) will be incorporated into the final SRD.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
65	Page 49,	Section 3.4.2.1:	This is first occurrence of Required Delivery Dates (RDDs) within delivery orders and its relationship to the RFP clause on ORDER LIMITATIONS needs to be explained. Is it the intent of this discussion to modify the RFP clause in any way? Do RDDs superceed the monthly delivery totals? *Rational*: One month with zero (0) deliveries, followed by the next month with 80 units, which averages out to 40 a month may not be in the contractor's or Navy's best interest! *Recommendation*: Update the RFP clause or SOW wording appropriately so that they are in agreement by discussing RDDs in both locations.	Since Order Limitations are specified by FAR Clause 52.216-19 and system delivery requirements are specified in Section F, SOW Section 3.4.2.1 will be deleted to prevent any conflicts in requirements.
66	Page 59,	Section 3.5:	There does not seem to be any mechanism, such as Technology Insertion/Refresh (that is NOT directly referenced here) to develop and qualify updates to or possibly new variants that then become orderable as part of the existing (or new) IDIQ CLINs. (Also, the only place where Technology Insertion/Refresh assumptions are provided to the contractor is as part Life Cycle Cost glossary entry on page A-2.) *Rationale*: CLINs 0009 and 0010 can be utilized to deliver administrative paperwork, studies and analyses, etc.; as well as updated or new CEDS variants. Recommendation: Specify the SOW "services" mechanism whereby new and updated variants become part of the existing (or new) IDIQ CLINs.	Duplicate question. See items 24 and 26.
67	Page 59,	Section 3.5:	The SOW states that "The contractor shall be required to establish contractual relationships with Government field activities…". Does the Navy intend to have various Navy Labs as "directed subcontractors" on this procurement? Also, are lab personnel to be made available to all potential bidders throughout the Phase I/Phase II competition? Recommendation: Change the phrase "contractual relationships" to possibly one of the following – "working relationships", "key relationships", "teaming agreement", "partnership", or "collaborative environment".	The Navy does not intend to have Navy Labs as "directed subcontractors" on this procurement. The requirement to establish contractual relationships with Government field activities will be deleted from the final RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
68	Page A-2:		Life Cycle Costs (LCC) defines service life as 15 years, yet the SRD (page 27) states that CEDS Service life is not less than 30 years. In addition, this is the only place where any Technology Insertion/Refresh assumptions are provided to the contractor in the Draft RPF. *Rationale*: The 15 year service life contained in the SOW is more reasonable. The 30 year service life is reasonable for the hull but not for COTS equipment. *Recommendation*: Change SRD service life requirement to match the 15 year service life defined in the SOW. Additionally, propagate the appropriate Technology Insertion/Refresh assumptions to the RFP and SRD.	Duplicate question, see item 42.
69	Page C-1,	Appendix C –	Performance Based Logistics Supply Support: The Navy needs to clarify the relationship between the CEDS SOW and this Appendix C SOW. When are the various CDRLs (CDRL 037, CDRL 054) referenced throughout this PBL SOW to be delivered? In particular, is any of the PBL SOW efforts to be performed prior to exercising CLIN 0007? *Rationale*: Appendices to the SOW are meant to just amplify the requirements in the body of a SOW, yet another complete SOW has been provided as an appendix. *Recommendation:* State what the PBL requirement prior to exercising CLIN 0007. In particular, what PBL requirements are to be included (and funded) as part of Phase I. Also, consider folding this appendix directly into the body of the SOW.	There are no PBL requirements prior to Phase II. Supply Support CDRLs specify delivery dates. CDRL 037 (provisioning data – developed as part of CLIN 0003, Development and Qualification) is due 120 days before PRR. CDRL 054 (Supply Support Performance Metrics – is required under CLIN 0007). The initial CDRL 054 report is due 120 days after LRIP; the submission frequency for this CDRL will be changed to monthly vice quarterly.
70	Page C-5,	Section 2.9,	Third sentence: Once the Supply Support Database is developed, how many changes (and what are their complexities) does the Navy desire the contractor to anticipate? *Rationale*: As written, the Navy can continually request changes to the design of the supply support database at no cost. Maintenance of the database is part of the cost-of-doing-business that is normalized as part of the product cost, but Navy-directed redesign of the database is not. *Recommendation*: Delete the words "and further development" from the sentence and add new sentence – Changes to the database design post-PRR will be directed via Program Services or Technical Engineering Services delivery orders.	Changes to the database design, post-PRR, will be directed via Program Services or Technical Engineering Services delivery orders. CDRL 055 will be corrected to indicate that the deliverable involves Navy review and approval of the databases format and content. The Database must be approved and in-place 30-days prior to PRR. Metric reports from the database are to be delivered every month.
71	Page C-40,	Section 5:	The appendix jumps from Section 4 to Section 6. *Recommendation*: If missing, add Section 5 or renumber Section 6 to become 5.	Paragraph numbering (nothing missing) will be corrected.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
72	Page C-43,	Attachment II	CEDS SOW Glossary: This second SOW Glossary is possibly a duplicate and definitely confusing. *Recommendation*: Remove this Appendix Glossary and incorporate any new terms into the primary CEDS SOW Glossary.	The Supply Support Glossary will be combined with SOW Glossary to avoid duplications.
73		3.3.7.2.2.2	A "TEPP" is called out. What is this?	TEPP is the "Test and Evaluation Program Plan," see reference in CDRL 034.
74	p13	Para 3.1.2.8,	Will there be regularly scheduled program reviews? If so, what will be the frequency?	There will be 2 initial executive program reviews per configuration (at CDR & PRR) followed by semi-annual reviews thereafter (beginning 6 months after PRR).
75	p13	3.1.2.9	Will there be regularly scheduled IPT meetings? If so, what will be the frequency?	IPT participation will be required and funded on an as-needed basis.
76	p18	Para 3.1.5,	Will there be regularly scheduled RWG meetings? If so, what will be the frequency?	RWG participation will be required and funded on an as-needed basis.
77	p32	Para 3.3.5.1,	The paragraph refers to "Government required tests…" for reliability. The tests requirements are not defined. What tests are required for reliability?	System reliability tests are specified in the SRD.
78	p32	Para 3.3.5.1,	It is specified that reliability requirements are to be verified by test, but there is not a CDRL requirement for a reliability test procedure and report. Should there be a CDRL requirement for a reliability test procedure and report?	System reliability tests are specified in the SRD. There are CDRLs which require the contractor to develop all test procedures and submit test reports.
79			**Overall:** Some CDRLs are only for CLIN 0002, most CDRLs are for CLIN 0008, but a number of the CDRLs are missing the CLIN #, and CLINs 0011, 0013 & 0015 have no CDRLs associated with them. Also, a number of duplicate CDRLs are provided based just on another SOW reference. *Overall Recommendation:* Resolve the CLIN numbering, remove the duplicate CDRLs or unnecessary CDRLS and add the other SOW references to the original CDRL. For example: CDRL 013, the Life Cycle Cost (LCC) and Independent Schedule Assessment (ISA) Report, only goes through PDR (i.e. CLIN 0002) Another example: CDRL 038, Training Conduct Support Document/Test Package, and CDRL 039, Instructional Media Package, should reference the data line item – CLIN 0015, not CLIN 0014. Another example: There are only two System Safety CDRL items listed (see below) • 010 - SYSTEM SAFETY HAZARD ANALYSIS REPORT	The CDRLs will be reviewed and modified to ensure proper CLIN numbers and SOW sections are referenced. Any duplicate CDRLs will be deleted**.**

| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
			(SSHA) • 062 - MANAGEMENT PLAN, SYSTEM SAFETY PLAN However, at the minimum, CDRLs for a full Safety Program should include the following tasks (subject to Navy approval) from MIL-STD-882C: • Task 101 - System Safety Program • Task 102 - System Safety Program Plan (this is Data Item 062) • Task 104 - System Safety Program Review/Audits • Task 106 - Hazard Tracking and Risk Resolution • Task 202 - Preliminary Hazard Analysis • Task 203 - Safety Requirements/Criteria Analysis • Task 205 - System Hazard Analysis (this is Data Item 010) • Task 301 - Safety Assessment Report • Task 303 - Safety Review of Engineering Change Proposals, Specification Change Notices, Software Problem Reports, and Requests for Deviation/Waiver • Task 401 - Safety Verification, and • Task 402 - Safety Compliance Assessment Is this really what the Navy wants for CEDS, as opposed to more Best Commercial Practices approach (e.g. UL listed, etc.) found in the commercial marketplace?	
80			Most/all CDRLS require "delivery to be in digital format to the Government's specified web site". What digital formats are acceptable – MicroSoft Office, Adobe Acrobat, others? *Also,* how should the contractor handle third party COTS manuals that we do not have source for and which is probably copyrighted by the originator? *Rational*: Both MicroSoft Office and Adobe Acrobat are widely available applications in the commercial marketplace with viewer software. *Recommendation*: Specify both MicroSoft Office and Adobe Acrobat as acceptable digital formats for delivery.	Section C of the RFP will be changed to clearly specify acceptable digital formats for CDRL delivery. Any unique exceptions to the Section C requirement will be specified on the applicable CDRL DD Form 1423.
81		CDRL 008;	References SOW paragraph 3.2.2.6—Should the reference be to PRR 3.3.2.2.6?	The SOW will be changed to reference SOW 3.3.2.2.6.
82		CDRLs, 022 and 023	SOW—Is the Systems Requirements Review (SRR), named in CDRL 022 and CDRL 023, a Phase #2 SRR? (Block 12 in CDRL 022 says the Marking Plan initial delivery is 90 days before SRR; Block 12 in CDRL 023 says the SW Development Plan initial delivery is 90 days before SRR.)	The submission dates for CDRL 022 and 023 will be changed to require delivery during Phase II of the contract.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
83		CDRL 041	(SOW para 3.3.3.2); CDRL 042 (SOW para 3.3.7.1), and CDRL 043 (SOW para 3.4.5)—Are the submittal/comment-period dates correct for these CDRLs? (Delivery dates for the CDRLs are NLT 90 days after SRR. Government has 30 days after delivery to approve and then contractor has 30 days to incorporate comments----total time is equal to total for all of Phase #1 of the program.)	The submission dates for CDRL 042 and 043 will be changed to require delivery during Phase II of the contract.
84		CDRL 060	—Block 12 refers to PRR and Block 16 remarks about PDR. Should references be to the same milestone for both blocks?	The Block 12 reference will be changed to PDR.
Questions 85-230 Pertain to the System Requirements Document (SRD)				
85			**Overall:** This SRD added a great deal of new testing requirements, two forms of ILS (traditional and Performance Based), and specified numerous "options" to the variants that will only drive the price up, while also requiring enclosure volumes/weights that are not amendable to a "family of products" and specifying out-of-date technology (e.g., 20" displays) that will not be supportable in the future. Additionally, there is no indication that any variant can be configured without the various "options" in SRD.	Comment noted.
86	Pages 10, and Page 24,	Section 3.2 Section 3.5.8.2:	Please clarify whether or not an Un-interruptible Power Source (UPS) is required since ECDIS-N certification requires a minimum of 30 minutes backup. *Rationale*: Neither the notional diagram of CEDS (and the Common Electronics Module on page 10) nor the power descriptions in section 3.5.8.2 (page 24) indicate a UPS requirement. IAW MIL-STD-1399, Section 300A, the individual equipment specification must include UPS if required. If it is the Navy's intention to provide an external UPS for all CEDS installations, then a separate CEDS UPS is not needed. *Recommendation*: Explicitly state that UPS is not desired for either the Display Consoles or the Remote Displays.	Whether or not an UPS is needed in the design is up to contractor, if an UPS is needed in the design, rationale will need to be provided.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
87	Page 13, and Page 27,	Section 3.5.2 Section 3.5.8.14:	Is it the intent of the Navy that the Display Console Enclosure be an EIA-310D 19" rack? *Rationale*: Section 3.5.1 (page 13) does not explicitly state that the enclosure is a 19" EIA-310D rack. Sections 3.5.1.1 and 3.5.1.2 (page 13) state that the enclosure must include the Common Electronics Module (CEM), but section 3.5.2 then states that the CEM must be mountable in a 19" rack, implying that the enclosure includes a 19" rack. Furthermore, section 3.5.8.14 reserves EIA-310D space within the CEDS enclosure for the End Cryptographic Units (ECUs), implying requirement for 19" rack. *Recommendation*: Modify section 3.5.1 to state that the Display Enclosure shall conform to the EIA-310D standard.	The SRD will be modified; the Display Console shall consist of screens, HMI devices, IA&A devices, the Common Electronics Module (CEM), and flat desk space. The CEM deck mounted unit physically separated from the Display Console but within the display Console's envelope.
88	Page 15,	Section 3.5.2.1.2:	What role will CEDS play with regard to the Common Presentation Layer (CPL)? Will CEDS be a "follower" and simply ensure that it provides the required hardware (graphics, display, HMI device) items, or will CEDS be involved in the definition of Human Computer Interface (HCI) style guides and/or implementation of the software to achieve this? Rationale: In order to achieve a CPL, the various commands and program offices have to agree on a common style guide (or guides for specific application areas – warfighting, HME, etc.). In today's computing environments this is achieved primarily through middleware/application software. If CEDS is just a computing platform that has to provide the necessary resources (e.g., graphics card, displays, HMI devices) that support the CPL application, this is not a new approach. Recommendation: Clarify the role of this specification and the overall contract with respect to the Common Presentation Layer. Also, any clarification may need to be reflected back in the CEDS SOW.	CEDS must provide the required hardware and software to support the Common Presentation Layer (CPL) developed by NAVSEA 03.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
89	Page 19,	Section 3.5.3:	a. Size – What is the rational for specifying the depth of the display to be no more than 8". In particular, how does this fit into the variant volumetrics? b. Resolution – ECDIS-N requires at least a resolution of 1280 X 1024, but this is an aspect ratio of 5 by 4, which is not where the market place is going in the future. For example, HDTV is 16 by 9 (or 4 by 3) and market place is really moving towards a "wider" HDTV (16 by 10) aspect ratio that satisfies multiple requirements (i.e., side-by-side TV picture, exact representation of CAD drawing side-by-side, etc.) c. Acoustic Data – Flicker test requirement reference should be 4.4.1.1.3.1 vice 4.3.1.1.a, but this requirement effectively limits the displays being supplied to one vendor that has a patent on a flicker compensation add-on. d. Touch Screen – The resistive touch screen technology has a high failure rate over time. This specification should include both infrared and SAW (surface acoustic wave) technology as well since these technologies have much better visual display and more reliable. *Rationale*: Limiting competition to out-of-date technology. *Recommendation*: Verify the overall need for these requirements as stated and the associated flicker testing for acoustic data. Additionally, consider providing this "flicker-free" display as an option for the displays. Also, correct the section references.	a. The depth of the displays is no longer specified, displays shall fit into the required Display Console volume. b. The SRD has been updated to reflect current Navy requirements. c. The performance of the display when presenting acoustic data is technology dependent. However, the test called out in the SRD is technology independent. d. The phrase "resistive" has been removed from the requirement to allow the use of other technologies providing they meet the all requirements.
90	Page 21,	Section 3.5.4. a.3:	Why must the trackball be mounted on the right side of the console? Why not both left and right trackballs on the console? *Rationale*: If we're truly interested in HSI, then the trackball should not be permanently fixed. The console should be able to accommodate both right- & left-handed people –simple ergonomics such as the location of the trackball should be flexible and quickly changed by each operator as needed. Additionally, a Joy Stick could be placed on the right-hand side of the bullnose and would allow for a trackball on the left-hand side. *Recommendation*: Change wording to: Mounting of the trackball shall accommodate both left-handed and right-handed operators or allow for both a Joy Stick and Trackball.	The SRD has been changed to provide the capability to position the Joystick and Trackball on either side of the display, capable of simultaneous installation.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
91	Page 23,	3.5.6. c:	How does the Navy propose using a biometric IA&A device under Chemical, Biological, Radiological (CBR) conditions? *Rationale*: The SRD lists fingerprint, iris and voice as example biometric IA&A devices. These devices cannot be used in a CBR environment as the hand is gloved, the iris is masked and the voice is muffled. The requirement to include a biometric device for IA&A will prevent restoration of a console in a CBR environment. *Recommendation*: Remove, or make it an option, the requirement for a 3rd (biometric) IA&A device.	This requirement has been deleted.
92	Page 26, and Page 31,	Section 3.5.8. 9 Section 3.6.5. 4:	This specification lists MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4 and ITU-T H.263 coding requirements. It should also include ITU-T H.264. *Rationale:* The specification should include a more logical grouping of requirements. *Recommendation:* Add ITU-T H.264 to the requirement.	ITU-T H.264 has been added.
93	Page 27,	Section 3.5.8. 14:	What is a CEDS Station? *Rationale*: Page 12 defines the CEDS Display Console as the console enclosure, CEM, screen(s), HMI devices, chair and IA&A devices. *Recommendation*: Reword to state "Each CEDS Display Console shall reserve…"	Station changed to Display Console.
94	Page 27,	Section 3.5.8. 14:	How much space is required to be reserved for End Cryptographic Unit (ECU)s and what does the phrase 'of 6U (1U = 1.75") total' refer to? *Rationale*: Paragraph states to reserve "2 EIA-310D (of 6U (1U = 1.75") total) within its chassis to house up to 4 ECUs. Each ECU shall be 1U high." If the ECU's total 4U, how can they fit into 2U? Can two ECU's be put into the space side-by-side? *Recommendation*: Please clarify the size of the ECUs and also specifically exclude their weight from the console weights on pages B-1 to B-4.	The SRD has been modified to reflect that each ECU is 1U high and that 2U of space needs to be reserved within the CEM. ECU documentation will be available at the release of the RFP.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
95	Page 27,	Section 3.5.9.1:	This paragraph states, "CEDS shall exhibit 95% confidence that 98% of the components shall survive for at least the stated MTBOMF." This appears to be inferring that the customer expects 2% of the components to account for half the failures experienced at the specified time. *Rationale:* Need clarification as to actual meaning of this requirement. As long as the MTBOMF is met the distribution among the components is not relevant, nor could such a parameter be managed. *Recommendation:* Recommend that the Navy change the requirement to a MTBOMF with a 95% confidence, and delete the reference to 98% of the components.	The SRD has been re-written to reflect, "CEDS shall isolate the failure down to a single LRU 95% of the time".
96	27, and 32,	3.5.9.2, 3.6.5.2:	Page A-2 of the SOW defines service life as 15 years yet the SRD states that CEDS Service life is not less than 30 years. Does this requirement refer to the display console, remote display or the various electronic assemblies. *Rationale*: The 15 year service life contained in the SOW is more reasonable. The 30 year service life is reasonable for the hull but not for COTS equipment. *Recommendation*: Change SRD service life requirement to match the 15 year service life defined in the SOW.	Duplicate question – See item 42.
97	Page 32,	3.7.1:	States that the Common Electronics Module (CEM) shall be common to all displays. Please clarify if the CEM should be common to both Display Consoles and Remote Displays or should be common within the display family. *Rationale*: This requirement is counter to the published acquisition strategy which allows for different contractors for Display Consoles and Remote Displays, producing different CEMs for each. As worded, a contractor who is bidding on both families would be penalized if the CEMs for Display Consoles and Remote Consoles were different. Yet, since the Remote Display CEM requirements may be different. *Recommendation*: Please reword to state that the CEM shall be common to all displays within the respective family (Display Console or Remote Display).	The SRD has been modified to reflect "The Common Electronics Module as a complete modular unit shall be common to all Display Consoles". The Common Electronic Module is not part of the Remote Display.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
98	Page 33,	Section 3.7.2.6:	Page B-5 states that Grade A shock is required for the Medium Screen Display (MSD), while Page B-6 states that Grade B shock is required for the Large Screen Display (LSD). *Rationale*: Page 10 stated that every mission could be accomplished without a Remote Display, implying that the Remote Display is mission essential (Grade B) vice mission critical equipment, yet the Shock requirement on page 33 only references Grade A. *Recommendation*: Change the Configuration Data Sheet for the MSD and LSD to both reflect Grade B shock requirement and then clarify the overall Shock requirements.	The SRD has been corrected to specify Grade B shock for remote displays.
99	Page 35,	Section 3.7.3.4:	States that CEDS shall be OACE Category III/IV compliant, yet Page 1 states that requirements for OACE IV are still in development. *Rationale*: Since OACE IV requirements have yet to be defined, a contractor can't reasonably be expected to submit a FFP proposal for an undefined requirement. It is conceivable that the final OACE IV requirements will not be defined until after Phase II of this acquisition is initiated. *Recommendation*: Restate the requirement to require a *threshold* of OACE III compliance with OACE IV compliance as a *goal*.	The SRD has been corrected to remove Category IV compliance.
100	Page 38,	Section 3.7.8.2:	States that **_all_** external painted surfaces shall be gray (#26307). This is over-restrictive and conflicts with the HSI requirements. *Rationale*: Framing the display surface in black provides better contrast for the operator. *Recommendation*: State that console enclosure external surfaces shall be painted gray (#26307). The display external surface may be painted a different color with approval by Navy during Preliminary Design Review.	The SRD has been modified to reflect the recommendation.
101	Page 38,	Section 3.7.10.	Recommend changing the acronym FCDS to CEDS. *Rationale*: Administrative *Recommendation*: Search and replace all occurrences of "FCDS" with "CEDS" prior to release of final the RFP documents.	"FCDS" will be changed to "CEDS" in the final SRD.
102	Page 39,	paragraph 3.8:	Is it the intention of the Navy that the LSD be constructed with 2 or more screen modules vice a single screen? *Rationale*: States that CEDS "shall support hatchability of a 30" diameter hatch (maximum diagonal distance of 29") and shall also be designed to fit through a standard 26"W X 45"H doorway…". The dimensions of the LSD on Page B-6 are 12"D X 62"W X 39"H. A single screen of this size cannot fit through a 30" diameter hatch. *Recommendation*: Restate the hatchability requirement to apply to the CEDS Display Consoles and Common Electronic Modules only.	The SRD has been modified to reflect comment.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
103	Page 45,	Section 3.10,	Item c: This item currently reads – "The CEDS shall be designed to ensure catastrophic failures do endanger personnel." *Recommendation:* Change the sentence for Item c to read – "c. The CEDS shall be designed to ensure catastrophic failures do NOT endanger personnel."	The SRD has been modified to reflect recommendation.
104	Page 45,	Section 3.12.3:	The last sentence of this paragraph conflicts with Section 3.5.2.2, Item b (on Page 19) for a Removable Storage Read/Write Drive. *Rationale:* The last sentence says no storage of data on *any* writable storage device is permissible. Per paragraph 3.5.2.2.b, CEDS includes a removable (vice internal) read/write storage device. *Recommendation:* Change last sentence to read: "There shall be no storage of data on any internal writable storage device."	The SRD has been modified to reflect this recommendation.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
105	Pages B-1 to B-4		Primary Screen – Size and Secondary Screen – Size: Why has the Navy specified only 20 or 20.1 inch diagonal screens? The requirement is for a 20 to 20.1" display with a resolution of 1600 X 1200 and a desired resolution of 3840 X 2400, but this second resolution would be unusable on a 20" display. This 20" form factor is being replaced with a 21.3" display at the required 1600 X 1200 resolution. As such, this specification should include 21.3" display as well and, where appropriate, allow for the possibility of a 24" display with a resolution of 1920 X 1200. _Rationale_: These four configuration data sheets specify that only a 20 or 20.1 in diagonal screen may be used. This glass size is nearing its end-of-life in the commercial marketplace, while 21" and 24" diagonal glass is much more commonplace. Maintaining the 20 or 20.1 in diagonal screen requirement will drive up the cost of the display consoles as this glass will need to be produce solely for this application or the console will need to go through redesign & qualification, increasing Life Cycle Cost. A console design that recognizes and accommodates commercial trends is in the best interest of the Navy. Additionally, computer displays are moving to a "wider" HDTV format – 16 by 10, from the current 4 by 3 ratio and, as such, systems being designed for future deployment should take this into account for the product selection. _Recommendation_: Change the requirement to read 'at least 20 in diagonal.'	This requirement has been changed to "at least 21 inches".

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
106	Page B-1,		Size Envelope: Why has the Navy specified this "Multi-Modal Workstation" configuration as no wider than 57 inches? *Rationale*: Recognizing that the commercial marketplace is moving towards larger displays, please consider changing the maximum width to at least 60 inches. This will allow the displays to keep pace with commercial marketplace without compromising HSI. At the current 57 inch width specification, using either out-of-date display technology or a common screen size from the commercial marketplace, operator efficiency will be reduced and operator fatigue will be increased as a sub-optimal resolution or viewing angle is required. *Recommendation*: Change the maximum width to 60 inches, twice the width of the CEDS Display console, variant "B" specified on pages B-2 & B-3, that is inline with the "family of products" console concept and results in lower overall cost of every variant. Also, consider changing the height to 50 inches, which is the height of variant "B" with the top screen removed.	Space constraints on the platforms specify the envelope requirement for the consoles and are reflected in the SRD.
107	Page B-1, Page B-2 and Page B-3,		Weight: Does the weight specified include the chair or not? *Rationale*: Since the size envelope excludes the chair, it is unclear if the weight also excludes the chair. Section 3.5.5 on page 22 states the chair is an option. The weights specified appear low if they include the chair. For instance, the "B" variant, has a total weight of 455 lbs for a Grade A Shock qualified console, chair & electronics. As a point of reference, the dual-headed water-cooled Q-70 console for CVN-77 weighs 840 lbs. *Recommendation*: Annotate the asterisk footnote to clarify the weight requirement.	The specified weight does not include the Display Console chair.
108	Page B-1, Page B-2 and Page B-3,		Shock: Is it the Navy's intent to require the chair to meet Grade A shock? *Rationale*: A Grade A shock-qualified chair adds additional cost and weight that may not be needed. *Recommendation*: Add another additional footnote to these tables that exclude the chair from Grade A shock requirement.	Yes, the Chair needs to meet the Grade A Shock Requirements. Safety of the operator is required.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
109	Pages B-2 & B-3,		Layout: What is the height of an "average" operator's horizontal line of sight? Will this "average" line of sight be realized through providing an adjustable chair or some other mechanism? *Rationale*: The requirement states that "if possible" one screen shall be located completely below the average operator's horizontal line of sight. This makes no sense because an average is not defined and even if it were, three people of the exact same height could have three different measurements for the horizontal line of sight, depending on their body portions (long legs, long torso, etc.) and how they adjust the chair. Human factors engineering references already provide appropriate guidance for locating the screens for the operator ease. The SRD should not provide additional requirements that may be in conflict. Since the requirement starts out "if possible" it appears that the Navy already knows this may be the case. *Recommendation*: Eliminate this sentence/requirement.	Placement of the screen shall be IAW ASTM-F 1166 and MIL-STD-1472. The identified sentence has been eliminated.
110	Page B-4,		Size Envelope: When will the Navy specify this requirement? *Rationale*: Size is listed as TBD. *Recommendation*: If the Navy cannot specify the size envelope of this configuration, remove the configuration from CLIN 0003. When the requirements are finalized, the contractor can develop and qualify this configuration under CLIN 0009 or CLIN 0010 and then procure this variant as part of the existing (or new) IDIQ CLINs.	The updated SRD will contain the size envelope for those Display Consoles.
111	Page B-5 and Page B-6,		Resolution: The MSD requires a resolution of 1280 X 768, while the LSD requires a resolution of 1365 X 768. This specification should require 1920 X 1080 for the resolution. *Rationale:* Displays of these sizes will be native HDTV resolution already or will be available as HDTV in the next year. *Recommendation:* Change the resolution to native HDTV as a minimum.	The SRD has been modified to make the resolutions of the LSD and MSD as minimums. The contractor may provide something better to the Navy if so desired.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
112	Page B-5 and Page B-6,		Size Envelope: The MSD has a not-to-exceed of 12" deep X 43" wide X 28" high, while the LSD has a not-to-exceed of 12" deep X 62" wide X 39" wide (both including mounting hardware). This specification should allow some slightly larger sizes such multiple 40" plus diagonal screens and 60" plus diagonal screens that can satisfy the MSD and LSD requirement, respectively. *Rationale:* Displays already come in various 40" plus diagonal screen sizes and will be available in multiple 60" plus diagonal screen sizes in the next year. (Note that a 46" diagonal screen and a 57" diagonal screen with HDTV is available today.) *Recommendation:* Change the MSD to a not-to not-to-exceed of 12" deep X 46" wide X 30" high, while the LSD has a not-to-exceed of 12" deep X 66" wide X 42" wide (both including mounting hardware).	This is the required size budget provided by the platforms.
113		1.3.f	- "Provide N-tiered architecture with separate client, presentation, middle, and data layers." What is meant by client in this context?	Section 1.3.f refers to the architectural model utilized by CEDS software. The nomenclature "client layer" refers to the layer of the CEDS software model that implements and provides a common standardized set of Applications Program Interfaces (APIs) which various software "clients" (i.e. specific combat systems software programs, modules, etc.) can utilize to request specific I/O actions (the display of a map in a window on the CEDS console, the selection of a point on that window display via a trackball tagging operation, etc.).
114		3.1	In para.3.1, the common electronics module is required to be "modularized to facilitate remote relocation". Is there a minimum or maximum distance that the common electronics module will be remoted? Many data transport protocols to support both the video and HMI devices have a limited usable signal distance.	The SRD requires the Common Electronic Module to be physically separate from the display console and co-located in the envelope of the Display Console.
115		1.3.g	- "Provide a Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) in which application functionality exists as a set of services that can be accessed by multiple clients and other services, layered on separate node-based and enterprise-wide infrastructures. What is meant by client in this context?	The term "client" in this context refers to the various software application programs or subsystems that may reside within the overall system-computing environment for which the CEDS console provides HSI I/O capability.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
116		3.1	In para.3.1, does the statement, "All CEDS displays shall be modular in nature, hard-mounted (e.g. bolted or utilizing the modular deck)…" mean that no isolators are allowed between the remote display or display console and the ship structure?	Yes.
117		Figure 2,	The video over IP is shown as a separate line from the LAN connections for the remote displays and listed separately in 3.5.8.7. Please clarify whether 4 or 5 ethernet ports are needed for each CEDS interface.	The Common Electronic Module requires 4 Ethernet ports, in addition to Video over IP.
118		3.1.2 and Figure 3	Please clarify the signals from the display consoles: are all three (Video over IP, RGB & DVI) required simultaneously, any one of three, or will this be determined by the display console provider?	The video output signals from the Display Console via the Common Electronic Module shall require Video over IP, RGB & DVI.
119		3.1.2 and Figure 3	Is the Display Console provider responsible for software to control video over IP, if so are the performance requirements for this fully identified in paragraph 3.6.4.5?	The only software required by the contractors will be the driver necessary to use the interface. The application software necessary to provide this capability will reside on the Total Ship's Computing System.
120		3.4	Are training modules required to be available as part of the nominal operating environment? If so, how much non-volatile memory will be required?	The training modules are the Computer Based Training that will be developed by the contractor under this contract. It is up to the contractor how he plans to implement the Training modules in the system.
121		3.5.1.3 and 3.5.1.4	Rack Based Displays - Is the rack part of the deliverable for the rack-based displays? Paragraphs 3.5.1.3 and 3.5.1.4 indicate that they will be mounted into "existing" racks. If so, when will the characteristics of these racks be provided?	No. The SRD references the rack standards.
122		3.5.2	Is the CEM required to take unconditioned power and be hard mounted if remoted?	The Common Electronics Module will take shipboard power and be hard mounted to the deck.
123		3.5.2.1.1.c	What is being booted from the network? Separation kernel? Only virtual operating systems?	The Virtual Operating System Software and any client software needed to perform the mission.
124		3.5.2.1.1.d	What (if any software) is loaded for SIT? Is it running the bootstrap, loading the separation kernel but not loading a virtual operating system since 3.5.2.1.2 says they aren't part of CEDS?	SIT requirements will be defined in the final SRD.
125		Figure 4	"Virtual Operating System" What is meant by Virtual Operating Systems? This is not normally synonymous with "Boot loaded Operating System environments and Applications" in the text.	This section of the SRD has been rewritten; Figure 4 has been deleted.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
126		3.5.2.1.2	Who is responsible for supplying compatible drivers between all of the hardware devices and the multiple OS domains?	The contractor is responsible.
127		3.5.2.1.2	How does the government intend to embed these drivers within the virtual OS load?	Implementation is left to the contractor
128		3.5.2.1.2	Is it the government's intent that the off line fault isolation, diagnostics and embedded training be bootable similar to a VOS, but booted locally from removable media?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
129		3.5.2.1.2	The sentence, ""The CEDS shall be capable of loading and supporting the functions <<???>> time and conventional POSIX compliant…" seems to be missing some words or punctuation, please restate.	The Display Console shall be capable of loading and supporting the functions of real-time and conventional POSIX compliant operating systems that comply with the operating system requirements called out in the OACE Technologies and Standards, Sections 4.5 and 5.5.
130		3.5.2.1.2	Can we assume that the separation kernel is supplied off the OACE network as part of the boot loaded OS and requires no non-volatile read-write capability within the CEDS console?	No, separation kernel will be part of the CEDS system.
131		3.5.2.1.2	What is the desired processing architecture for CEDS: Intel X86, SUN Sparc, Power PC, other; or will the Architecture be determined by the Display Console Provider? If so how does a Remote Display provider ensure compatibility i.e. Video Over IP Driver/Application?	Implementation is left to the contractor. Video over IP uses network protocols.
132		3.5.2.1.2	What is the Operating System and Driver support required for CEDS HMI devices: LINUX, Solaris, Windows or other?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
133		3.5.2.1.2	Please identify the required N-Tier Middleware products intended to be supported so CEDS suppliers can ensure Virtual Machine, OS, Processing architecture availability.	Implementation is left to the contractor.
134		3.5.2.1.3	It is believed that the Common Presentation Layer specification is currently an incomplete document. Will a final version be available with the RFP?	IWS 6.0 is not responsible for CPL. When the RFP is released, the current revision/definition of the CPL will be used. CEDS should be capable of running software written IAW the CPL. It is not the PEO IWS-6's intention to develop CPL compliant software on the CEDS contract.
135		3.5.2.1.4	If the operating system is outside CEDS how can we monitor OS processes?	Performance monitoring will track the state of the CEDS. Implementation is left to the Contractor.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
136		3.5.2.1.4	Is CEDS required to draw performance information to a screen used by an operating system without a process running on the operating system? Will the process monitor be a networkbased application that will create the performance monitoring screen or does the CEDS require a local OS and application that can display the performance status when called?	Diagnostic information can originate from two physical sources. Initial hardware diagnostics will derive from Built-in Test (BIT) firmware running in ROM or Flash-RAM on the console hardware. There will be a rudimentary hardware boot-up display capability of BIT information on the console itself, or via an external serial port (or other external I/O connection). The CEDS console will also be capable of much more extensive self-test reporting and display using diagnostic software modules uploaded to the console hardware after boot-up. These software diagnostic modules will provide much further network-based performance monitoring and error-detection the extended capabilities. Implementation is left to the Contractor.
137		3.5.2.1.5	If Direct X is required does this force a x86 processor running Windows for the architecture since only Windows supports Direct X?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
138		3.5.2.1.5	How are screen distributed to operating systems? Dedicated or shared? Is it possible that a screen must support multiple windows running different operating systems?	Any operating system shall be able to go to any screen. Yes. Yes.
139		3.5.2.1.5.e	In the requirement for "16-bit pseudo color", what was intended? Is this an index color visual where the pixel value is looked up in a table to generate RGB? That does not seem to be a normally supported standard. 16-bit is normally used for direct RGB visual applications.	This requirement derives from the need to maintain backwards compatibility with a wide range of currently existing software applications, which are based on various existing graphics systems and standards. The requirement should not be difficult to implement, as most graphics hardware systems support Color Lookup Table (CLUT) capabilities in some form or another.
140		3.5.2.1.5	ECDIS-N - Is it completely compatible with the remainder of 3.5.2.1.5?	ECDIS-N requirements should fall within the capabilities of the graphics system as outlined within 3.5.2.1.5. It is important to note, however, that ECDIS-N certification is based on the proper values for color, saturation, hue, etc. and is a certification process more than it is a hardware requirement.
141		3.5.2.1.5h	Is EO/IR a defined format? If so, please provide a reference.	This requirement has been deleted.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
142		3.5.2.1.5h	What resolution needs to be supported for display of JPEG 2000 30 fps?	JPEG 2000 (or any JPEG for that matter) should be able to support a number of resolutions.
143		3.5.2.1.5i	Is it required that a display console shall run three main displays @ 1600 x 1200 and two remote displays @ 1260 x 768 and 1365 x 768 all simultaneously and aspect/resolution corrected?	Yes.
144		3.5.2.1.5i	It is required that the display console support two remote displays? Will these displays have unique data and operations or will they be duplicate feeds of one of the existing displays? Will the remote displays require any HMI input control (mouse, keyboard, joystick) from the display console?	Yes. Remote displays shall be able to display any window that is able to be displayed at the console. Yes, the remote display will be driven from the display console.
145		3.5.2.1.5	How will which display (1, 2, 3) being sent to the remote display be controlled: hardware switch or software? If it is RGB or DVI, will it be a KVM? If it is Video Over IP how do we determine compatibility (App/OS/Firmware) with the remote display provider?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
146		3.5.2.1.5i	How should the remote display handle video sources of different resolutions (e.g. Main Displays on Display Consoles are 1600 x 1200 or 3840 x 2400, but remote displays are 1280 x 768 or 1380 x 768)? Should we assume native resolution will be over IP and we are responsible to down convert/scale, or will an application or native remote display resolution be provided?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
147		3.5.2.1.5i -	As the Display Console resolutions are different aspect ratio vs. the remote displays, can we assume that the remote display provider is not responsible for distorted pictures?	No. The Remote Display should include the appropriate software drivers with the capability of scaling the image to fit within the remote display. It should also maintain the proper aspect ratio.
148		3.5.2.1.6 -	Is CEDS required to provide an OS and application to provide the communication functions listed in this section, or will the application and storage locations be provided on the network? Furthermore, in order to be compliant with 3.12.3 and 3.12.5, can it be assumed that these user profiles (HRTF, voice recognition) will be stored on the OACE network versus stored locally?	No. Yes.
149		3.5.2.1.6 -	What is threshold acceptance for CEDS for "rendering up to 64 concurrent sound sources and be expandable to a number sufficient to accommodate the anticipated future needs of the sonar community."?	The SRD has been updated to remove this vague requirement.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
150		3.5.2.2b –	Please explain how to resolve the apparent conflict between this paragraph and paragraphs 3.12.3 and 3.12.5	The SRD has been modified to clarify this requirement.
151		3.5.2.2.b -	Is the 160 GB removable drive a non-mission critical sub-component?	No.
152		3.5.3.g -	It is required that the display be direct sunlight readable? Please provide measurable luminance and contrast requirements.	Yes. Information is contained in the final SRD.
153		3.5.3.i -	Is it the government's intention to have the optional illuminated writing surface and the optional touch screen both be installed at the same time on the same display surface? "The surface of the screen shall not restrict or inhibit writing on the surface with a grease pencil". Does this requirement apply when there is the optional touch screen? Is there a preferred touch screen technology?	The writing surface requirement has been removed.
154		3.5.3.j -	Is the cited pixel response time for pixel turn-on or pixel turn-off or both?	This requirement has been deleted.
155		3.5.4.c -	Is there a CEDS configuration that requires simultaneous use of the joystick along with a trackball, or is it acceptable to replace one with the other?	See question 90.
156		3.5.4.d -	Is the Display Console provider required to supply the headset? Is there any foreseen requirement for a closed headset?	Yes. Yes, there will be an optional sonar-type headset.
157		3.5.4.d -	Can headset volume be controlled on the headset, or does the volume control have to be on the console?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
158		3.5.4.d -	Is head tracking relative to the CEDS console?	The requirement for head tracking has been deleted in the SRD.
159		3.5.4.d.4 -	"The headphone speaker shall be sensitive to 106 dBmW +/-4 dBmW". This doesn't seem to be a standard speaker specification. Normally they are power in to sound level out. Is there a reference source for this specification?	The SRD has been reworded.
160		3.5.4.e -	Does this imply that the speakers can be turned back on after plugging in the headset?	No.
161		3.5.4.f -	Does the footswitch fulfill the hands-free operation requirement in section 3.5.4.d?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
162		3.5.6.a -	Is the IA&A interface to policy server outside the operating system? Can we assume that only off-line functions are supported?	The IA&A is interfaced to the OACE. No.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
163		3.5.6	SRD gives the performance requirements for the IA&A device. Para.3.5.2.1.2 requires that the IA&A components be fully functional in both On-Line and Off-Line modes. In order for the IA&A system to be used, authentication must occur where a password and a biometric is compared against similar data for the specific user. Will this password and biometric data be resident on the CAC card or will the data be resident on a network server (requiring network access)? Will IA&A authentication be required for Off-Line Modes?	Biometric requirements have been deleted. SMART Card information will be defined in the SRD. SMART Card IA&A will be required for offline modes.
164		3.5.7.3	SRD requires that the CEDS mount to ISO 7166 modular deck systems. Is there a minimum requirement for "allowing the equipment to be moved in one-inch orthogonal increments"? Also, are there mechanical mounting/bonding characteristics for the ISO 7166 with respect to shock and vibration versus deck plate mounting?	The requirements are as stated in ISO 7166. The equipment shall be capable of being mounted to a modular deck or a deck plate and pass the shock and vibration requirements specified in the SRD.
165		3.5.8.2.b -	Is the 400 Hz power three phase or single phase? MIL-STD-704 says 3-phase for power draws greater than 500 Va. Is 50 ms holdup required?	Three phase. 50 ms holdup is required.
166			Is it the government's desire that the CEDS use a single power supply capable of being used in all consoles, surface, sub-surface and airborne, or is it acceptable to have a different power supply for airborne applications?	Power requirements are referenced in the SRD. Implementation is left to the Contractor.
167		3.5.8.3 -	LAN Connections - the common electronics module as well as the remote displays are required to provide at least 4 ethernet ports. In paragraph 3.5.8.3, it is required that the console be capable of interfacing to fiber optics and twisted pair copper cabling. Is it the government's desire that there be 1 fiber and 1 copper port on each of the 4 LAN inputs? Or is this requirement satisfied by having 2 fiber and 2 copper ports? Or does the government want each module to be orderable with copper or fiber connections as an option?	The 4 LAN connection requirements for the Remote Display have been deleted. The LAN ports requirements for the Display Console should be modular in nature, allowing the user to install either fiber or copper twisted-pair modules in each port, as the need arises.
168		3.5.8.6 –	Please clarify how the government will make use of the video input interfaces (IP, DVI, RGB) to the CEM (e.g. how will video source be selected, to which display will it be routed, and does it occupy the full display or a window within the display)?	These video input sources should be software-selectable and the video should be capable of being displayed either in full-screen or in-a-window mode. Since video needs to be digitized and incorporated into the display data stream for remote display capabilities, it should be feasible.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
169		3.5.8.7	Video Outputs - 3.5.8.7 requires that both video outputs be able to supply DVI, RGB SOG, and IP addressable (including both fiber and copper types). Is it the government's desire that the video output/s have all connector types available? How will the source of the video output be selected within the CEDS environment?	Connector type will be determined by industry standards. Implementation is left to the contractor.
170		3.5.8.8 -	Does this mean that the sound powered headset connector must be part of the CEDS console or is it sufficient to provide a mounting attachment point for a self-contained sound powered unit? Is there a specific mounting configuration required? Would the government provide a reference for this information?	The Display Console shall provide space for the mounting of a sound powered phone device. Implementation is left to the contractor.
171		3.5.8.9	Voice over IP - Is the contractor required to provide VOIP software to support this requirement? Are there any special HMI devices beyond the existing headset and footswitch required for this? Is there a unique LAN Connection required for VOIP services?	Implementations are left to the contractor.
172		3.5.8.12.2.4	SRD indicates than an unsafe indicator should be lit when the internal temperature exceeds 60C. However, Section 3.9.3 requires that the internal equipment not exceed 55C. Which is the driving paragraph 3.9.3 or 3.5.8.12.2.4?	The SRD has been modified to clarify this requirement.
173		3.5.8.14 –	Is the total space reserved for ECU 6U? Does the ECU only require physical mounting from CEDS but no other support such as power? What weight needs to be accommodated? What is there a maximum depth of the ECU? Are connectors on the front or rear of the ECU? When will an ICD for the ECU be provided?	The SRD has been modified to clarify this requirement. ECU documentation will be provided at the final RFP.
174		3.6.1 -	It is required that the display be direct sunlight readable. Please provide measurable luminance and contrast requirements.	See response to item 152.
175		3.6.1.a	SRD requires that the screens "display consoles" be arranged per Mil-Std 1472. It is believed that 3.6.1.a is not applicable for the remote displays. Please clarify.	This requirement has been deleted.
176		3.6.1.h	SRD requires that the remote displays provide an optional illuminated writing surface. Please confirm that this requirement will apply to the remote displays.	This requirement has been deleted
177		3.6.2.1	SRD indicates that speakers are required for the remote displays. How will audio data be transmitted to the remote displays? What is the source of any audio data (analog, IP, RCA jack, etc.) that will be broadcast at the remote displays?	This requirement has been deleted

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
178		3.6.4.3 -	Four network interfaces are not illustrated on Figure 3. Please clarify the intended usage of these four required LAN connections.	This requirement has been deleted.
179		3.7.1 -	Is it the government's intent to have a Common Electronics Module that is common to both the Remote Displays and the Display consoles, if so how can two different vendors supply the CEM and also how would the Remote Displays accommodate an EIA 310 electronics module?	See response to item 97.
180		3.7.3.1 -	Is paragraph 3.13 the correct SRD reference?	This reference has been corrected.
181		3.7.10.a –	Please note that FCDS is referenced rather than CEDS.	This reference has been corrected.
182		3.7.10.b -	Is the CPU LRU called out in this requirement the CEM?	This has been corrected.
183		3.9.2.a	SRD limits disagree with 3.9.2.4.a - are test points allowed for voltages over 30Vrms?	This has been corrected.
184		3.10.c -	Please confirm that the text was intended to read: "The CEDS shall be designed to ensure catastrophic failures do NOT endanger personnel."	This has been corrected.
185		3.12.1	SRD states that, "NSA shall provide additional software-only requirements associated with Information assurance". Is there any indication what these requirements are or when they will be made available?	All requirements will be defined in the final SRD.
186		3.12.2 –	Can we assume that firmware updates are only performed at the depot-level?	No, when allowed, firmware update will be performed at the organizational level.
187		3.12.3 and 3.12.5 –	Can we assume that any writable requirements such as user profiles, specific OS drivers, and domain dependent utilities are resident on OACE?	Yes.
188		3.12.4 –	Please define the specific requirements for physical security?	The requirements have been updated in the SRD.
189		4.4.1.2.1.4 -	The following is in conflict with LSD being class B in table B-6. "The equipment shall maintain normal operation before, during, and after the shock event. System reboots shall not be allowed." Please confirm that the Appendix B indication of Grade B over-rides this statement.	The SRD has updated to specify Grade B requirements.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
190		Appendix B:	Can the display sizes and resolutions for the display consoles be considered a minimum requirement?	The SRD has been updated to reflect these values as minimums.
191			Are the resolutions defined for the LSD and MSD threshold requirements?	The SRD has been updated to reflect these values as minimums.
192		B.1.3 -	Vertical 2 Screen Rack weight is specified as 200 lbs in Parentheses the appendix states "not including enclosure". Please clarify definition of the enclosure.	Enclosure is defined here as being a shipboard rack-like structure.
193		B.1.3 -	Will the government use the Common Electronics Module as the processor for the Vertical 2-Screen Rack-Based Display Console?	Yes.
194		B.1.4 -	Single Screen Rack weight is specified as 65 lbs in Parentheses the appendix states "not including enclosure". Please clarify definition of the enclosure.	See response to item 192.
195		B.1.4 -	Will the government use the Common Electronics Module as the processor for the Single Screen Rack-Based Display Console?	Yes.
196		B.1.4 -	The requirement states that the keyboard will be retractable. Does the Single Screen Console require all of the HMI devices supplied for the other variants or does it simply need a keyboard?	All the HSI devices need to be on a stowable bullnose.
197		B.2.1 /B2.2 -	Why are the resolutions different for the MSD and LSD (1280 x 768 and 1365 x 768)?	These resolutions are established and required by host platforms.
198			It is our understanding that the waterfall compensation capability is not needed at every installation. If PEO IWS wants to reduce the cost of the CEDS Display System, would they consider removing the waterfall compensation requirement from some of the units purchased and using a modular approach?	No, as this affects commonality.
199			Is PEO IWS willing to accept a product that does not fully meet the requirements in an effort to make the monitor more economical? • What are the most important requirements? • What are the lowest priority requirements?	It is the intent of PEO IWS to obtain a display that meets all of the performance requirements as specified in the final approved SRD.
200			Given the software and performance requirements, we would recommend VME architecture, however there is a new technology coming out – microTCA that provides the performance capabilities in an Intel/Open architecture. Given the time frame for the program, there will be some vendors who will have product in production by mid 2006. I have attached preliminary information about mTCA for your review.	Comment noted, but no associated change to the SRD documentation is anticipated.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
201		3.5.2.1.6-7	Paragraph 3.5.2.1.6 states CEDS shall perform voice recognition. Paragraph 3.5.2.1.7 states that voice recognition is an optional goal. Please clarify.	Voice recognition requirement have been deleted.
202		3.5.4.a.2	For clarity, recommend that paragraph 3.5.4.a.2 of the SRD be modified to read as follows, "Minimum diameter of 2.5 inches and maximum diameter of 4 inches".	The recommended change will be incorporated.
203		3.5.4.a.6	For clarity, recommend that SRD paragraph 3.5.4.a.6 be modified to read as follows: "Impervious to damage from vertical pressures up to 75 pounds, forced azimuthal rotation of ball assembly, perspiration, and shipboard dust/dirt.	The recommended change will be incorporated.
204		3.5.4.c	Please clarify the optional joystick requirements specified in SRD paragraph 3.5.4.c. Does CEDS provide or does it merely accommodate the joystick?	The SRD has been updated to clarify this requirement.
205		3.5.5.a	For clarity, recommend that the last sentence in SRD paragraph 3.5.5.a be modified to read as follows: "The chair and deck interface shall allow sufficient clearance of any maintenance door to allow full access with minimal maintenance impact when the chair is in its normal position".	The recommended change will be incorporated.
206		3.5.5.d	SRD paragraph 3.5.5.d does not seem relevant to the display console chair. Please clarify.	This requirement was moved to the appropriate paragraph.
207		3.5.8.12.2.4	Recommend that SRD paragraph 3.5.8.12.2.4 be modified to read "High Temperature Indicator".	The recommended change will be incorporated.
208		3.5.8.14	Please specify, in inches, how much space is to be reserved by SRD paragraph 3.5.8.14. The requirement seems to be either 7 or 10.5 inches.	This paragraph has been re-written for clarification.
209		3.5.10, 3.6.6, and 3.11.1	For clarity, recommend the second sentence of SRD paragraphs 3.5.10, 3.6.6, and 3.11.1 be modified to read as follows: "To minimize rear system clearance requirements, all maintenance access shall be provided in and all maintenance shall be performed from the front".	The recommended change will be incorporated.
210		3.6.1.a	SRD paragraph 3.6.1.a should be changed to read remote displays.	The recommended change will be incorporated.
211		3.6.4.6	Display console in SRD paragraph 3.6.4.6 should be changed to remote displays.	The recommended change will be incorporated.
212		3.7.2.2	For clarity, recommend that paragraph 3.7.2.2 of the SRD be modified to read as follows: "The equipment shall not be damaged nor shall operational performance be degraded when restored to the operating temperature after being subjected to the non-operating temperature range of -40˚C to +70˚C."	The recommended change will be incorporated.
213		3.7.2.7	Recommend that the words "…of Sea State 6 - 8" in SRD paragraph 3.7.2.7 be changed to read "…through Sea State 8".	The recommended change will be incorporated.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
214		3.7.12	What processes does SRD paragraph 3.7.12 refer to?	The SRD refers to the processes by which the contractor designs, develops, and manufactures CEDS.
215		3.9.2.4.c	Recommend that paragraph 3.9.2.4.c of the SRD be modified to read as follows: "Assemblies operating at potentials in excess of 500 volts shall be completely enclosed from the remainder of the assembly and equipped with interlocks that cannot be bypassed."	The recommended change will be incorporated.
216		4.4.1.2.1.4.c	SRD paragraphs 4.4.1.2.1.4.c and .d should be re-worded. Something is missing.	This paragraph will be re-worded.
217		B-3	SRD Table B-3, Size Envelope - Is the 41U dimension an internal capacity dimension or an external height dimension. If the latter, and for consistency, recommend using 71.75".	The recommended change will be incorporated.
218		B-3 and B-4	SRD Tables B-3 and B-4, Weight - If the specified weights do not include the enclosures and the CEMs, what is included?	The SRD has been modified for clarification.
219		3.12.1	SRD 3.12.1 Unspecified requirement - "NSA shall provide additional software-only requirements associated with Information Assurance." Please clarify.	See response to item 185.
220		B.1.4	SRD B.1.4 Config C Rack Mt. Unclear - Must meet shock with keyboard stowed or extended (both)?	The SRD has been modified for clarification.
221		3.5.2.1.5.h	SRD 3.5.2.1.5.h The first sentence of SRD para.3.5.2.1.5.a states that CEDS shall support live video feed in "…EO/IR…" format. Please clarify by specifying the format of EO/IO video feeds.	See response to item 141.
222		B.2.1	Please confirm that the 1280 X 768 resolution specified in SRD Table B-5 is a minimum resolution.	Correct, it is the minimum resolution.
223		3.1.3.2.f	SOW 3.1.3.2.f OA - Garbled sentence. Please clarify.	This sentence will be revised for clarity in the final SOW.
224		3.5.3	SRD 3.5.3 Optional Touchscreen Configuration does not specify required resolution, although this parameter is essential to task performance and a determinant of material cost.	The touchscreen shall have the same resolution as a screen without a touchscreen capability.
225		3.10.c	SRD 3.10.c. " CEDS shall be designed to ensure catastrophic failures do [not] endanger personnel." The word "not" is missing.	This will be corrected, see item 103.
226		4.4.1.2.1.4	SRD 4.4.1.2.1.4 Shock - "MIL-STD-516.5 Procedure VIII" should read "MIL-STD-810 Method 516.5, Procedure VIII"	This will be corrected.
227		App B2	Appendix B2. Remote Displays. Speaker volume control is specified (80dB range) but speaker output (watts) is unspecified. Also, the audio signal interface to the required speakers is undefined. Please clarify.	The speaker requirement for the remote display has been deleted.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
228		3.5.7.2, 3.6.3.2, 3.8	SRD sections 3.5.7.2 and 3.6.3.2 requires that the size support "hatchability". Section 3.8 on Transportability requires "the CEDS, its modular subcomponents and/or its shipping and storage package shall support hatchability of a 30 inch diameter hatch (max. diagonal distance of 29 inches) and shall also be designed to fit through a standard 26" W x 45" H doorway (includes 8" radius rounded corners). Appendix B indicates the configuration sizes: - Variant A: 57" W X 48" H X 44.5" D - Variant B: 30" W X 68" H X 44.5" D - Variant C: 30" W X 41U H X 44.5" D - Variant D: TBD - Variant E: 43" W X 28" H X 12" D - Variant F: 62" W X 39" H X 12" D Variant F is not modular and will not fit through a 30 inch hatch. Variant D size is TBD but is slated for Air environment. Please clarify hatchability and or door opening requirements for each variant.	This will be corrected, see item 102.
229		3.5.5	SRD section 3.5.5 requires CEDS display console shall include a chair option. The chair is noted for all consoles in Appendix B sizes except variant D, which is listed as TBD. Is chair option required for Variant D? If not, do environmental requirements for air applications apply to the chair option? Please clarify.	A chair is an option for all Display Consoles.
230		3.1 & 3.7.2	SRD section 3.1 identifies Variant D for air system environment. Section 3.7.2 references specifications unique to each family and application to Appendix B. Appendix B identifies shock as grade A, implying Mil-Std-901 for surface/subsurface requirement. Please clarify that Variant D only requires design and testing to air environmental requirements not surface/subsurface requirements.	The SRD has been re-written for clarification.
231		3.1.2.3	There is no SOW paragraph number 3.1.2.3	Paragraph numbering will be corrected in the final RFP.
232		3.1.2.7	There is no CDRL associated with the deliverable specified in SOW para.3.1.2.7.	The SOW will require risk metrics be reported as part of the Contractor's monthly Progress, Management, and Status report.
233		3.1.3.2.e	Please clarify the concepts of reuse and exceptions to reuse in SOW para.3.1.3.2.e.	The Navy desires to minimize the R&D effort and expects the contractor to provide their "off-the-shelf" solutions, or modifications thereof, to meet CEDS requirements. If there are reasons (such as cost or schedule) as to why a contractor is unable to reuse existing solutions or technology, justification must be provided.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
234		3.1.3.4	SOW Pg. 17 para.3.1.3.4 Is there guidance or a reference wrt 'Net Centric Implementation Framework?	The Net Centric Implementation Framework can be obtained via the NESI Public Website, http://nesipublic.spawar.navy.mil
Questions 235-305 Pertain to the System Requirements Document (SRD)				
235			Para 1.2, p1 states that OACE Category IV requirements are still in development, while Section 3.7.3.4 on page 35 states that CEDS shall be Cat IV compliant. Are the Cat IV requirements expected to be available at the time of RFP?	See item 99.
236			SRD Para 1.3, p1, item d Please define the term "shared spaces."	A shared space is an area that is accessible to more than one user. This space will be in the OACE.
237			Para 3.2, p11, Figure 3 Please explain for the "(Alternate Video Solution)" labeled at the bottom of Figure 3, by what means is the alternate video selected? Does this alternate video solution input identify a separate physical interface, or is this a virtual alternative to the VoIP that is included with the arrow on the left side of Figure 3.	The SRD has been updated.
238			Para 3.4, p12, item a Please clarify if a means to physically disconnect the CEDS from the OACE network is required.	Once installed, CEDS is not required to be physically disconnected from the OACE.
239			Para 3.4, p12, Table II, and Para 3.5.2.1.2, p14—Please clarify if the term "Active/Autonomous" is equivalent to running training simulation locally. Are there to be any off-line mode capabilities other than running training locally off the CDROM drive?	Yes, "Active/Autonomous" indicates that the console is running from a local software load (i.e. CDROM or non-volatile memory); the console may not be connected to the network. In addition, there will probably be an off-line loadable extended diagnostics and training capability, which will run off of CDROM or non-volatile memory.
240			Para 3.4, p12, Table II What is the difference between the two tan modes "Logon Network…?" They seem to be identical, unless part of the second mode was dropped off by the formatting after the second slash.	This figure has been corrected.
241			Para 3.4 What interaction/relationship is intended between the CEDS states and modes and the states and modes of the platform's operational software applications?	Platform application software will be downloaded to run on CEDS in the online mode.
242			Para 3.5.1.1 – 3.5.1.4, p13 Is there intended to be a unique power requirement for the 1-screen rack-based display console, since para.3.5.1.4 includes the term "power system," but paras.3.5.1.1-3.5.1.3 do not?	These paragraphs have been corrected. There are no unique power requirements.
243			Para 3.5.2, p13 Please clarify "The Common Electronics Module shall be…modularized to facilitate remote location," to include distance from the console/rack, power source when remoted, location of the ECUs (para 3.5.8.14) in relation to this module when remoted, etc.	The remote requirement has been removed.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
244			Para 3.5.2.1.2, p14 Please clarify who will be responsible for supplying, integrating, and testing the mission applications and associated operating systems into CEDS.	The platform system integrator will be responsible for testing the OS and applications.
245			Para 3.5.2.1.2, p15, first line under Figure 4 Please define the term "functions time."	This paragraph has been corrected.
246			Para 3.5.2.1.2, p15 Does the Government envision that there will be just one or multiple operating systems compliant with OACE Technologies and Standards section 4.5 and 5.5 to be used with CEDS. If multiple operating systems, will the government identify these?	There may be multiple domains operating at any given time. Each domain will be running a separate real-time or standard POSIX compliant operating system, as defined in the OACE documents.
247			Para 3.5.2.1.2, p15, Figure 4 Is the requirement for only one application to run on its Virtual OS at a given time? Should it be interpreted that the CEDS processor is running at one classification although connected to Multiple Security Levels?	Not necessarily. No. CEDS will be supporting multiple classifications at any given moment.
248			Para 3.5.2.1.2, p15, "CEDS shall be capable of loading and running multiple domains…". Is the desire for simultaneous processing and display of multiple operating system domains, each of which accesses a single different security domain, and each of which is simultaneously executing numerous processes and threads?	Yes.
249			Para 3.5.2.1.5, p18, item h Are any 4x3 video formats required for MPEG2?	All formats supported by MPEG2 should be available for use by console applications.
250			Para 3.5.2.1.5, p18, item h What are the maximum bit-rate requirements for each video encoding format?	Bit-rates are specified in the SRD.
251			Para 3.5.2.1.5, p18, item I Regarding the graphics that will be run on the Remote Displays, will these be independent from the images run on the Display Console, and will each of the Remote Displays be showing the same graphical image or different images?	Graphic images on the Remote Displays could be different from those on the Display Consoles. Graphic images could also be the same.
252			Para 3.5.2.2, p19 mentions a removable storage read/write drive, while Section 3.12.3, page 45 states that there shall be no storage of data on any writable storage devices. Please clarify.	The SRD has been re-written to clarify this requirement.
253			Para 3.5.2.3, p19 How does the Multiple Independent Levels of Security (MILS) program/initiative affect CEDS requirements with respect to MSL?	The SRD is being revised to provide additional guidance on the MSL requirement.
254			Para 3.5.4, p21, item a3 As described, there are no provisions needed to mount the trackball on the left side of the desktop to accommodate left-handed operators. Will there be requirements to accommodate left-handed operators?	No.
255			Para 3.5.8.2, p24, item c, and Para 3.6.4.2, p30, item b, Please clarify if the 1200 watts specified in 3.5.8.2.c is for the entire display console and the 1200 watts in 3.6.4.2 are for the combined remote displays.	The power requirement for the Display Console is 1200 watts, for Remote Displays it is 400 watts.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
256			Para 3.5.8.3, p25, item a Are the four ports inclusive or exclusive of the connections to the remote displays, and are these four ports intended to be the interfaces for and support the capabilities of paras.3.5.8.6-10?	These four ports are connected to the total ship computing system. They are not going to the Remote Displays or to be used in 3.5.8.6-10.
257			Para 3.5.8.4, p25 Is the intention for each of the four USB ports to be fixed allocated to a certain operating domain, or able to be dynamically allocated across operating domains that may be at different security levels?	USB requirements have been redefined within the SRD.
258			Para 3.5.8.5, p25 Is it the intention for the serial port to be fixed allocated to a specific operating domain or able to be dynamically allocated across domains at different security levels?	See response to item 257.
259			Para 3.5.8.6, p25 What is the source and security classification of the video that is coming into the specified interface?	The source and security classification of video signals is dependent upon the platform. CEDS displays must support any possible security classification.
260			Para 3.5.8.6, p25 What is to be done with the Video that comes in over each of the specified interfaces (Ethernet, DVI, RGB)? a) Is it to be routed to one of the Console Displays? b) Is it to be routed to one of the Remote Displays? c) Is it to be routed to both Console and Remote Displays? The diagram in Figure 2 does not specify RGB or DVI for this interface.	This requirement has been deleted.
261			Para 3.5.8.6, p25, Para 3.5.8.7, p25, and Para 3.6.4.4, p30 Why is RGB Sync on Green specified? Most modern commercial monitors support RGBHV (Horizontal and Vertical Sync) and no longer support sync on green.	Sync-on-Green is a common video standard, which allows the co-existence of other sync standards mentioned. It allows the use (in a pinch) of a composite monitor on the green-only line for diagnostic and other quick-check purposes.
262			Para 3.5.8.6, p25, and Para 3.6.4.4, p30 Is the Video over IP unicast and/or multicast?	This is a software and networking implementation issue and is dealt with in the OACE infrastructure.
263			Para 3.5.8.7, p25 What is the maximum distance that a remote display would be from the CEDS console?	The distance is defined by the video standard.
264			Para 3.5.8.7, p25 When the CEDS is connected to the remote display via Ethernet, will the interconnect be point-to-point or via a network?	Networked.
265			Para 3.5.8.7, p25 Should we assume that the classification of these interfaces (Ethernet, DVI, RGB) could be unclassified through TS/SCI?	Yes.
266			Para 3.5.8.7, p25 Will there be a crypto on this interface?	No.
267			Para 3.5.8.7, p25 Are there any cryptos that support DVI or RGB?	Cryptos are not required for video.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
268			Para 3.5.8.10, p26, and Para 3.6.4.5, p31 Is CEDS responsible for the GUI/HMI to allow the operator to select the network based audio and video source to be displayed or is the Application going to provide this functionality?	The CEDS software suite should provide the capability to switch video sources, as well as provide a standard Applications Program Interface (API) or Service which will allow applications to also control the selection, when applicable.
269			Para 3.5.8.12, p26 Is there a requirement for front panel control switches to select between several audio channels for the headphones?	This is an application that would be downloaded to CEDS.
270			Para 3.5.8.12.1.1 and Para 3.5.8.12.1.2, p26 Is it a requirement to separate the Main Power switch from the Circuit Breaker, or can these be one and the same?	Implementation is left to the contractor.
271			Para 3.5.8.14, p27 Is the requirement for 2 X 6U = 12 U total or just 6U total reserved for ECUs? Please clarify.	The requirement has been clarified in the final SRD.
272			Para 3.5.8.14, p27 Is CEDS responsible for ECU key and the key management plan?	No.
273			Para 3.5.8.14, p27 Can additional/specific information be provided on the planned ECU types (part numbers, capabilities, protection levels/capabilities, interface requirements, power and signal, etc.)?	ECU documentation will be provided with the RFP.
274			Para 3.6.4.3, p30 Please clarify the purpose of having a minimum of four Ethernet ports on the remote displays? Is the intent to connect to the multiple domains of varying security classifications?	This requirement has been deleted.
275			Para 3.6.4.3, p30 What device controls the flow of data from each of the network interfaces to the display, and is this controlled by the Display Console operator?	This requirement has been deleted.
276			Para 3.6.4.4, p30 Is the "network (Ethernet)" in the first sentence one of the Gigabit Ethernet ports referred to in paragraph 3.6.4.3, or is this an additional port?	The video network requirement has been deleted.
277			Para 3.6.4.4, p30 What is the security classification of this video (unclass through TS/SCI)?	Yes, unclassified through TS/SCI.
278			Para 3.7.2.6, p33 Since Table B-6 shows that the Large Screen Display is only required to meet Grade B shock, should Para.3.7.2.6 make exception for the LSD?	This has been corrected.
279			Para 3.7.2.14, p34 What level of TEMPEST will be required?	CEDS TEMPEST requirements will be addressed in the final SRD.
280			Para 3.12, p45 Paragraph 4.4.1.7 indicates the requirements in this section will be verified by test. Please describe the test configuration since the networks and applications are not part of this development? Will a set of applications and test network be defined for verification purposes?	The contractor is responsible for developing test procedures and identifying test configurations to verify CEDS displays meet SRD requirements.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
281			Para 3.12, p45 Is the intent to prove separation of information only in the CEDS? Is the CEDS contractor required to support a System level security certification (outside of this contract) for the network that will host the CEDS?	Yes. The contractor is not required to support system level security certification.
282			Para 3.12.1, p45 The effort to prove that the CEDS provides adequate confidentiality while connected to networks of multiple classifications (TS-SCI to Unclassified) could be significant. How is "confidentiality" to be tested if applications are not part of this development?	Applications are not required for NSA certification of the display to EAL 6+.
283			Para 3.12.1, p45 In what timeframe is it expected that NSA will be providing the additional SW requirements? (Pre or Post RFP?)	All requirements will be defined in the final RPF.
284			Para 3.12.2, p45, item a Is this an on-line mode requirement? Can the processor write to the secondary non-volatile memory (3.5.2.2d) in off-line mode?	Yes. No.
285			Para 3.12.2, p45, item b If the network is not available, should the CEM boot from NV Memory, DVD/CD, or external drive?	Yes.
286			Para 3.12.4, p45 Further definition of "protect internal systems from tampering" is needed. Will the tamperproof requirements come from NSA and if so, when?	Tamperproof requirements will be defined in the final SRD.
287			Appendix B, pB-1, Table B-1 Are screen resolutions expressed maximum. Is multisync capability desired for other possible display modes e.g. 1280X1024 & 1600X1024	Resolutions are expressed as minimums. Multisyncing is not required.
288			Does the Navy envision an approach to accept the best of existing and emerging technologies to fulfill or exceed the notional requirements specified in the SRD and to provide significant extensibility to the architecture?	The Navy intends to make a "best value" contract award based on an evaluation of the Offeror's Management Approach and Capabilities, Technical Approach, Cost Proposal, and Past Performance.
289			Does the Navy envision, or desire that this be accomplished by using standards based IO links to physically separate the display graphics function, HMI, and the IA&A from the CEM node (i.e., from 0 to 500m) from program inception?	CEDS displays should be designed to meet the requirements of the SRD.
290			If so, can the IA&A devices be located a significant distance (< 500m) from the console application host computer?	IA&A device required locations are specified in the SRD.
291			Does the Navy value a fully disaggregated model to provide a combination of low risk with investment preservation over multiple technology refresh cycles?	The Navy intends to make a "best value" contract award based on an evaluation of the Offeror's Management Approach and Capabilities, Technical Approach, Cost Proposal, and Past Performance.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
292			As a small business, [deleted] Company is very interested in this new direction the US Navy is pursuing relative to enterprise-class architectures for tactical computing and display systems. We have already spent considerable IR&D dollars to develop equipment that lines up with what we read in the Draft SRD – while we may not be in a position to act as the prime contractor on a project of this scope, we are 100% sure we can play a significant role in helping the USN realize a contemporary enterprise display architecture. Further, this can be accomplished via a relatively small suite of systems embodied by a uniform set of disaggregated, modular COTS components designed FOR the unique needs of, not just the USN, but of Military & Aerospace customers of all types.	Comment noted, but will result in no change to the RFP documentation.

293			Not sure why there is not a specification for brightness level in the SRD? For viewing displays on the bridge of a ship or sometimes in a very brightly lit room brightness is important.
			   1. Recommend setting a specification for brightness.
			     - - Additionally the specification should be challenging. Current LCD technology can meet a specification of less than 250 foot lamberts (fL). And if that is what is specified in the SRD, industry will deliver LCD technology.
			     - - However, Company Name feels that by setting a minimum brightness specification of at least 400 fL it will help to challenge industry to consider and deliver even newer technology.
				The SRD has been modified to reflect added brightness and contrast to the screen requirements.

294			Some of the specifications stated in the SRD are unique to LCD or plasma technology and may not be applicable standards for other technologies (like rear projection technology) such as:
			  - - pixel response time
			  - - dead pixel limits
			  - - flicker test
			How will IWS6 evaluate these other technologies if they can't meet these standards or will they waive these specifications?
				The performance of the display when presenting acoustic data is technology dependent. However, the test specified in the SRD is technology independent. The requirements for pixel response time and dead pixel limits have been deleted from the SRD.
				
				It is the intent of PEO IWS to procure a system that meets all requirements of the SRD.

295			The graphic resolution objective of 3840x2400 is an odd format and not appear likely to become an industry standard? Is the objective of CED to push for the highest resolution in a standard format?	The SRD has been updated to reflect current market changes.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
296			In the Governments CEDS System Requirements Document, the term "Multiple Security Level(s) (MSL)" is used in paragraphs 1.2.b, 1.3.b, 3.5.2.1.2, 3.5.2.3, and 3.5.8.14 with no detail of what a specific requirement would be; does the Government plan on providing further, more detailed requirements for MSL and if so, when?	CEDS shall be capable of providing up to four multiple domains to be running simultaneously. Requirements for multiple domains have been modified in the SRD.
297			CEDS System Requirements Document, paragraph 3.5.8.14, requires "CEDS shall be capable of interfacing with ECUs…". When will the complete interface control documents for the ECUs be made available so that necessary considerations, beyond the height of the unit(s), for data interfaces, power, cooling, maintainability, etc. can be adequately considered for the CEDS Display Console design?	ICDs for the ECUs are planned to be provided with the final RFP.
298			CEDS System Requirements Document, paragraph 3.5.5 is the requirement for a Display Console Chair but in subparagraph 3.5.5.d it specifies forearm support for the Display Console. Is it the intent of the Government to have a keyboard and trackball mounted to the Display Console Chair or would it be more appropriate to have this requirement as part of paragraph 3.5.4.b?	Wrist support is required for the desktop, not the chair. The SRD has been modified appropriately.
299			The Navy has stated this is a draft Systems Requirements Document (SRD) and "is subject to modification". What is the Navy's plan to mature the requirements in this SRD and provide them to the bidders prior to Phase 1 and selected contractors during Phase 1?	The final SRD will be released with the final RFP.
300			Paragraph 3.5.3(i), Screen Surface, specifies that "The screen shall provide an optional illuminated writing surface with adjustable edge lighting or its equivalent". Please clarify this requirement. Is the optional illuminated writing surface to be an integral part of the display, or is the intention that the display unit provide illumination of the writing surface of the desktop?	This requirement has been deleted.
301			Paragraph 3.5.3(m), Touch Screen, specifies that "There shall be an optional touch screen capability for each Display Console screen surface." Is it acceptable to provide a touch screen capability by attaching a separate touch screen element to the front of the display bezel instead of physically integrating the touch screen feature into the display unit? The logistics benefit of using a separate element would be a common display unit configuration across all installations, regardless of whether a touch screen is required for a specific application or not.	How this requirement is implemented is left to the contractor. It is up to the contractor to propose a solution based on alternative studies.

	PAGE	PARA	COMMENT	RESPONSE
302			Paragraph 3.5.3(i), Screen Surface, specifies that "The material used for the surface of the screen shall not restrict or inhibit writing on the surface with a grease pencil." However, 3.5.3(m) specifies a requirement for an optional, resistive touchscreen. Is it required that screens with the optional touch screen capability also allow writing on the surface with a grease pencil?	The requirement to write on the surface of the screen has been deleted.
303			Paragraph 3.5.3(m), Touch Screen, specifies an optional, resistive touchscreen. Would alternate touchscreen technologies be considered if they meet the requirement to work with gloved hands or stylus? Infrared touch screens, for example, are more durable than resistive touchscreens, provide better optical performance, have the best shock performance, and perform better in high humidity conditions.	The phrase "resistive" has been removed from the requirement to allow the use of other technologies, provided they meet all other requirements.
304			Appendix B specifies a 20 or 20.1 inch diagonal screen size for console mounted displays. Would a 21.3 inch screen size be acceptable if the display is compatible with the EIA-310-D standard for 19-inch wide rack mountable electronics mounting? The 21.3-inch LCD will be more readily available in the future than 20 or 20.1 inch sizes, based on current trends in the commercial LCD industry. The use of a 21.3 inch screen size will reduce the likelihood of obsolescence issues and reduce system costs.	The SRD has been updated to reflect a minimum display size.
305			Is it the intention of the Navy to procure kits of equipment for the rack-mounted console variants for installation in existing, or separately Provided, 19-inch racks? In other words, is it fair to assume that the 19-inch rack itself is not a deliverable under this contract? If this is the case, should we assume that the racks into which the equipment will be installed will have no shock isolation (i.e., the racks will be hard mounted)? If kits are to be installed in various, existing 19-inch racks, how will shock, vibration, EMI and tempest qualification in those racks be accomplished?	Yes. These kits shall be capable of meeting the environmental requirements of those Navy racks.
306			Will industry be authorized to team with Navy Field Activities in the execution of the CEDS program?	No. The following direction will be provided in Section L of the Solicitation: "Offeror's shall not enter into teaming agreements with any Federal Government activities, including but not limited to Navy Field Activities. Proposals including teaming agreements with Federal Government Activities will not be considered for award under this solicitation."